

JPRS-UIA-86-001

2 JANUARY 1986

USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

No. 4, JULY-AUGUST 1985

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000121 041

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

2 January 1986

**USSR REPORT
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD**

No 4, JULY-AUGUST 1985

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language journal RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR, published six times a year in Moscow by the Institute of the International Workers' Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

Information on Authors (p 192)	1
--	---

APPROACHING THE 27TH CPSU CONGRESS

Problems Facing Soviet Social Scientists in Studying Capitalism (pp 3-13) (A.M. Rumyantsev)	3
World War II Lessons Applied to Present (pp 14-27) (V.V. Zagladin)	17
International Trade Union Movement, Ideological Struggle Viewed (pp 28-36) (A.M. Subbotin)	27
Transnational Corporations: A System of International Exploitation of Hired Labor (pp 37-46) (R.I. Tsvylev) (not translated)	
The Experience of the First People's Revolution of the 20th Century (pp 47-61) (B.I. Koval) (not translated)	

IN THE COUNTRIES OF SOCIALISM

More Flexible Approach to Economics in Laos Viewed (pp 62-73) (V.A. Dolnikova and S.I. Ioanesyan)	38
Socialist Competition: Traditions and Contemporary Times (pp 74-82) (S.A. Arzhavkin) (not translated)	

THE CONDITION AND STRUGGLE OF WORKING PEOPLE IN DEVELOPED CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

The Miners' General Strike in Great Britain: Reasons, Character, and Significance (pp 83-95) (S.A. Yershov) (not translated)	
The Workers Movement In Australia Under the Labor Government (pp 96-105) (B.Ya. Dorofeyev) (not translated)	

Working Youth of Japan: New Developments in Vital Aspirations and Political Preferences (pp 106-118) (Yu.I. Berezina) (not translated)	
Effects of Microelectronic Revolution on Employment Discussed (pp 119-124) (V.S. Azhayeva)	53

THE STRUGGLE OF IDEAS IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

The Vatican's Past, Present Policy on Liberation Theology Viewed (pp 125-137) (L.D. Khodorkovskiy)	65
---	----

PAGES OF HISTORY

History or Apologetics? (pp 138-149) (M.A. Zaborov) (not translated)	
---	--

REPORTS

The Stakhanovite Movement: Results and Prospects of Study (pp 150-153) (V.Z. Drobizhev, S.V. Karpenko, and N.N. Rasuvayeva) (not translated)	
---	--

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

Conference on Experience of WWII, Contemporary Problems Held (pp 154-159) (S.I. Tatishchev)	81
Meeting on International Workers Movement Held (pp 159-160) (A.I. Dmitriyev)	91
Capitalism and the Problem of Foreign Workers (pp 161-163) (T.N. Chernova) (not translated)	
Meeting in the History Archives Institute (p 163) (V.P. [initials only given]) (not translated)	

REFLECTIONS ON MATTERS DISCUSSED

The Philosophy of Peace in the Nuclear Age (pp 164-169) (K.M. Kantor) (not translated)	
---	--

CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Review by A.A. Agaryshev of book by A.M. Sharkov: "Militarism -- The Enemy of Nature and Society" (pp 170-172) (not translated)	
Review by Ye.B. Chernyak of book by Yu.P. Mador: "The Strike in Bourgeois Society" (pp 173-176) (not translated)	
Review by V.V. Motylev and V.V. Vadimov of book by Yu.A. Borko: "Economic Integration and Social Development in Conditions of Capitalism: Bourgeois Theory and the Experience of the European Community" (pp 176-179) (not translated)	
Review by N.M. Tutayev and O.I. Shkaratan of book by O.N. Yanitskiy: "The Ecology of Hunger" (pp 179-182) (not translated)	
Review by A.M. Kukharchuk of book in French by Marcel Rigout: "Another Way. A Profession for Success" (pp 183-185) (not translated)	

BOOKS IN BRIEF

Review by V.V. Ivanenko of book by A.I. Avrus, L.G. Babichenko, and Yu.A. Lvunin: "Loyalty to Proletarian Internationalism. Essays on the History of the Soviet Section of the International Organization for Aid to the Champions of Revolution" (pp 186-187) (not translated)

Review by T.P. Matveyeva of book by N.M. Nikulin: "The German CP in the Struggle for Peace and Social Progress" (pp 187-188) (not translated)

Review by B.D. Kozenko of book by I.M. Savelyeva: "Trade Unions and American Society in the 20th Century" (pp 189-190) (not translated)

Table of Contents in English (p 191)

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : THE WORKING CLASS AND THE CONTEMPORARY
WORLD

Russian title : RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : I.K. Pantin

Publishing House : Izdatelstvo "Progress"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : July-August 1985

Signed to press : 24 July 1985

Copies : 9,978

COPYRIGHT: : "Rabochiy klass i sovremenny mir", 1985

INFORMATION ON AUTHORS

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 p 192

[List of main authors in this issue, with their positions and titles]

[Text] Rumyantsev, Aleksey Matveyevich -- academician, member of the bureau of the USSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics

Zagladin, Vadim Valentinovich -- doctor of philosophical sciences, professor

Subbotin, Aleksandr Mikhaylovich -- AUCCTU secretary

Tsvylev Ralf Ivanovich -- doctor of economic sciences, head of a scientific group of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD [Institute of the International Workers Movement]

Koval, Boris Iosifovich -- doctor of historical sciences, professor, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD

Dolnikova, Valentina Adamovna -- candidate of historical sciences, docent of the ISAA [Institute of the Countries of Asia and Africa] at Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov

Ioanesyan, Salima Ishmuradovna -- candidate of economic sciences, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies

Arzhavkin, Spartak Aleksandrovich -- chief of the AUCCTU department of socialist competition and mass production work

Yershov, Stal Aleksandrovich -- doctor of historical sciences, professor, sector chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD

Dorofeyev, Boris Yakovlevich -- candidate of historical sciences, associate of the scientific research department of the VShPD [AUCCTU Higher School of Trade Unionism]

Berezina, Yuliya Iyosifovna -- candidate of geographic sciences, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD

Azhayeva, Valentina Sergeyevna -- senior editor of the USSR Academy of Sciences INION [Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences]

Khodorkovskiy, Leonid Dmitriyevich -- doctor of historical sciences, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD

Zaborov, Mikhail Abramovich -- doctor of historical sciences, sector chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremenyy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

PROBLEMS FACING SOVIET SOCIAL SCIENTISTS IN STUDYING CAPITALISM

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 3-13

[Article by Aleksey Matveyevich Rumyantsev, academician and member of the bureau of the USSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics, under the rubric "Approaching the 27th CPSU Congress": "An Important Direction of Soviet Social Scientists' Research"]

[Text] During direct preparation for the regular 27th congress of our party, the entire Soviet people are summing up the work between congresses, thoughtfully analyzing our achievements and determining ways to eradicate shortcomings, and outlining the basic directions of future activity to solve crucial problems of economic and social development. As the decree of the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee "The Convocation of the Regular 27th CPSU Congress" noted, the efforts of party organizations and labor collectives must be focused on all-out intensification of production on the basis of broad introduction of the achievements of scientific-technical progress, refinement of planning and management, and strengthening of organization, discipline, and order in all links of the national economy.

On the threshold of the 27th Congress, Soviet scientists are required to conduct a deep, well-grounded scientific evaluation of advances in social development, including processes occurring in the capitalist countries.

The topic of this article is socioeconomic processes under capitalism and problems which arise for Soviet social science in connection with them. As the materials of this same April Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee noted, the step-up in imperialism's subsersive activity against the socialist states in recent years is spreading to all spheres -- political, economic, ideological, and military. Imperialist policies are directed both against the countries of the socialist community and against national-liberation movements and working people in capitalist countries. This gives rise to the challenge for scientists representing the most diverse detachments of Soviet social science -- historians, political scientists, economists, and sociologists -- to comprehensively study capitalism.

This is even more important since the prevention of a global military conflict in today's nuclear age is a prerequisite of any progressive social development. In this specific sense we may speak of the new content of

Lenin's famous thesis that politics takes precedence over economics. There is no doubt of the special significance of politics in the contemporary world and accordingly the importance of the research of scientists who study international relations and domestic policy problems.

In particular, social scientists face the task of formulating the major theoretical problems of analyzing the socioeconomic situation in the countries of capitalism.

The results of a number of research projects published in recent years by Soviet and foreign Marxists help realize this task. Thus, work has been completed on the eight-volume work "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii" [The International Workers Movement. Questions of History and Theory]. Scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement have prepared such monographs as "Tekhnologicheskiye sviggi, nayemnyy trud i rabocheye dvizheniye razvitykh kapitalisticheskikh stran. Novyye tendentsii v sfere zanyatosti" [Technological Advances, Hired Labor, and the Workers Movement of Developed Capitalist Countries. New Trends in the Sphere of Employment] (under the editorship of A.A. Galkin) and "Imperializm i proletariat" [Imperialism and the Proletariat], (author -- T.T. Timofeyev). USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO [Institute of World Economics and International Relations] published the monograph "Internatsionalizatsiya kapitala i rabochiy klass" [The Internationalization of Capital and the Working Class] (under the editorship of V.V. Lyubimova). The work of GDR social scientists -- the monograph "The General Crisis of Capitalism" -- should be noted. A number of interesting theoretical articles have been published in the journals MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR, and others.

Without assuming the task of giving an exhaustive description of the achievements of Marxist thought in the field of the study of contemporary capitalism and the position of the working class, let us nonetheless note that the soundness of the major conclusions and evaluations of Marxists regarding contemporary capitalism is confirmed by the entire course of its development in the last decade. It was precisely in this period that capitalism entered a new period of profound economic upheavals, a sharp slowdown in the rate of economic growth, and aggravated social contradictions. In the course of 10 years (from 1974 through 1983) the capitalist world endured two of the deepest and most protracted cyclical crises: 1974-1975 and 1980-1982. The myth of the possibility of capitalism developing without crises under state-monopoly regulation of the economy was finally shattered. Marxist scientists' evaluation of the period of the relatively high economic growth rate in capitalism's development in the 1950's and 1960's as transitory, the result of a number of temporal factors, was completely borne out.

Marxists' study of the interrelationship between the aggravation of the general and structural crisis of capitalism, on the one hand, and the increased duration and frequency of the cyclical crises, on the other, was very important to evaluating socioeconomic processes in the capitalist world. Identifying the growing role of noncyclical factors which helped aggravate the problems of capitalist reproduction makes it possible to evaluate with adequate certainty the potential of further development of the capitalist

economy in the foreseeable future. From this standpoint, determining the specific characteristics of the structural crisis in present conditions becomes of paramount importance.

With certain differences in defining the range and particular aspects of the present structural crisis, Marxists do not consider it merely a protracted crisis in such sectors as metallurgy, ship building, the textile industry, the automotive industry, and a number of other sectors. The specific nature of the present structural crisis cannot be completely clarified without analyzing such processes as the increased destabilizing influence of traditional corporations and the new type of monopoly -- conglomerates -- on the economies of certain countries and the extreme growth of the banking and stock exchange sector, which services business' speculative transactions, and so forth.

The negative consequences of the activities of transnational corporations, whose role in the capitalist economy is growing, should be specially singled out. With an enormous amount of resources available and extending their activity to the entire capitalist world, transnational corporations give less and less consideration to the national interests of particular countries. Moreover, their activities increasingly contradict the interests of those countries in which they operate. A new sphere of contradictions has arisen and is steadily developing: between state-monopoly regulation within national borders and the activities of transnational corporations on a global basis. The negative influence of this factor will clearly increase in the future. Militarization, the scope of which has increased immeasurably since the beginning of the 1980's when the R. Reagan administration came into power in the United States, has a strong destabilizing influence on the economy of contemporary capitalism. The research of Soviet and foreign Marxists has repeatedly and convincingly proven that increased military expenditures and expanded military production lead to the extremely one-sided "flourishing" of only a narrow circle of sectors of industry dominated by enterprises which fulfill military orders. The negative consequences of increased military expenditures in both their short-term and long-term aspects inevitably affect the entire economy. A great many more jobs could be created in civilian sectors with the capital which is spent on preparations for war. We will note in passing that many bourgeois researchers studying this question also come to similar conclusions.

The new round of the arms race unleashed at the start of the 1980's by the U.S. ruling circles and supported by their NATO allies is leading to greater and greater exacerbation of the contradictions of capitalist reproduction. The link between increased military expenditures and the higher deficits of state budgets in capitalist countries, the sizes of which have substantially risen in recent years, especially in the United States, is unquestionable. As a result, the American government is forced to borrow more and more capital on the loan capital market, leading to rapid growth in the National Debt, which reached 1.6 trillion dollars in 1984.¹ Since R. Reagan came into power, he has already approached Congress several times for legislative permission to raise the limit on the National Debt. Interest payments on the National Debt have become the third largest sub-heading of the budget.

A similar process is occurring in other developed capitalist countries. In the FRG, the state debt almost doubled as compared to national product in the last decade. England, Japan, and the FRG spend more money on interest and loan payments than on education and scientific research. In 1984 as a whole, countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] spent an amount equal to approximately 5 percent of their gross national product for interest payments on the state debt.

The state is increasingly forced to turn to the loan capital market in order to cover budget deficits; this is inevitably accompanied by an increase in the loan interest rate with all its negative consequences for investments in industrial production and housing construction. At the same time external economic problems are also sharply aggravated. In particular, the policy of "expensive money" conducted by the American administration has led to an artificial increase in the dollar's rate of exchange and, correspondingly, to a reduction in the competitiveness of American export products as well as an enormous increase in the foreign trade deficit (125 billion dollars in 1984). This policy helps "pour" foreign capital into the United States (it totaled 150 billion dollars in 1983 alone).² In this way, the United States covers a substantial part of its military expenditures through the resources of other countries. This prevents the development of their economies, arouses growing dissatisfaction, especially in the countries of Western Europe, and ultimately leads to the aggravation of interimperialist contradictions. The entire tangle of unsolvable problems which arise as a result of the further escalation of the arms race not only threatens a profound new recession in the United States and other leading countries of the West in the near future, but also threatens that reliance on militarism will limit the potential for economic growth in the capitalist world.

In connection with this, one must not fail to mention President Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Within the framework of this program, the ruling circles of the United States are stepping up preparations for "star wars." Full expenditures for developing systems of fundamentally new weapons -- antisatellite systems, various types of lasers, communications systems, and other types of weapons -- will total approximately 1 trillion dollars according to preliminary estimates. This sum of money is the largest which military-industrial monopolies will receive since the time of World War II. Diversion of colossal new resources for military purposes will undoubtedly complicate even further the financial-economic problems of the United States and its NATO allies, who are now being intensively drawn into the American space venture.

However, without hopes of a fundamental economic boom, no easing of the unemployment problem in the capitalist world can be expected. During the comparatively short period from 1975 through 1984, the army of the unemployed in developed capitalist countries increased by 80 percent -- from 15.6 million to 28.9 million people.³ In order to reduce it to the level of the late 1970's and provide the new generation of labor resources with work in countries belonging to the OECD, at least 35 million jobs, including in the "Common Market" countries, must be created in the second half of the 1980's. One can imagine how complicated this task is if it is taken into account that in 1973-1979, employment in OECD countries increased by 18 million people,

while in the last 5 years it increased by only 2.5 million people. Changes in the dynamics of employment are to a significant extent due to the monopolies' growing orientation toward labor-saving equipment and the maximal use of contemporary methods of rationalizing production. The change in trends in the employment sphere mentioned is very problematical. Moreover, in our day we can clearly discern a transition to a qualitatively new stage in the scientific-technical revolution in which robot technologies will be widely used for producing many articles in mass demand.

The present prognoses of the development of production automation with the use of microcomputers and robots contain rather pessimistic evaluations of the impact of new equipment on the employment rate. Although the absolute number of robots is still small, it is growing rapidly as production costs and the use of robots become comparable to costs for paying the workers who are replaced.

New equipment also has an increasing impact on the service sphere, which is figuratively called the "last refuge" of employment. On the whole, the orientation of technical reorganization in present conditions demands that the role of capital investments in the process of capitalist reproduction be reevaluated. Where they formerly represented the main accelerator of an economic boom, leading to increased employment and consumption, in present conditions their stimulative effect is becoming weaker and weaker.

The deterioration of the general situation on the hired labor market represents a major element of evaluating the position of working people at the present time and in the foreseeable future. Monopoly capital uses the situation which has developed as a lever for pressure on the working class and the organized worker movement. For this purpose the shift of production to regions and countries with lower wages is expanding, a policy of so-called decentralization of production is being used, and the orientation to temporary forms of employment is increasing. "Dispersing" production into branches and subcontracting firms and using home workers more and more extensively in a number of sectors, monopolies are attempting to disorganize trade unions and impose fundamentally new, significantly worse conditions of employment on the working class and its organizations. The developing form of employment for a limited time, often through middleman firms which take part of the wages to pay for their services and deprive temporary workers of the protection of trade unions, also plays a similar role.

Along with its unique "legal" attack on working class rights, the bourgeoisie also uses the situation which has developed in the labor market to increase production in the rapidly growing "illegal" sector of the economy, where conditions of employment and labor coincide in many respects to those which existed at the start of the century. According to data of the International Labor Organization, in the United States the "shadow" economy employs about 25 million, in the FRG and Great Britain -- 2-3 million, and in Italy -- about 7 million people, from 10-35 percent of the entire gainfully employed population.⁴ Enterprises in the "shadow" economy mainly use the labor of immigrants, as well as elderly workers and young people who have the least chance of finding a job.

The monopolies' attack on the rights of working people has particularly increased since the start of the 1980's. Not hesitating even at blackmail -- threatening enterprise closings and new mass firings, monopoly capital is trying to reduce the growth rate of wages, freeze them, and in a number of cases actually reduce the labor payment rate. A steady decline in the real earnings of working people has been taking place in the United States for several decades. They have declined by 3.5 percent in the 4 years the R. Reagan administration has been in power. The end of the latest cyclical crisis did not stop the offensive of the American monopolies. According to data of a survey by the U.S. Department of Labor, collective contracts concluded by trade unions with employers in 1983 envisioned only a 1.7 percent increase in the wage rate in the first year of operation of the agreements. This is the lowest figure in the last 15 years. The earnings of approximately 400,000 workers and employees covered by collective contracts which envision a direct decline in the nominal wage, as well as the earnings of those of the 400,000 people whose wage rate is "frozen" in accordance with the conditions of the agreements till the collective contract runs out (most of them run out in 1986), have declined even further.

A similar situation is also developing in the labor payment sphere in most other developed capitalist countries. In 1981-1983 and the first 6 months of 1984 the rise in prices exceeded the increase in the nominal hourly rate of industrial workers in Canada, Belgium, the FRG, Holland, Sweden, and Norway. The rise in retail prices was higher than the increase in monthly earnings in Japan in this same period. The data cited does not take account of the impact of increased taxes and payments into the social security system on the real buying power of working people. When they are considered, the number of countries where the real incomes of working people are declining is even greater.

A further decline in the earnings level is possible in the future because in many countries the massive onslaught of the bourgeois state and the business owners forced trade unions to agree to partial or full abolition of the wage scale with automatic wage increases tied to increases in prices. Complete or partial abolition of the sliding wage scale, which insured a 50-60 percent increase in earnings in the 1970's, was carried out in 1983-1984 in the United States, Italy, France, and Australia.

At the same time as earnings decline, social payments to working people are being cut back. According to data of the French national center on problems of social security, in 1983 alone 15 developed capitalist countries reduced expenditures for insurance for illness, and others reduced expenditures for medical services. Programs for offering assistance to needy families are being cut back. At the same time, working people's payments into the social security system in the form of taxes and contributions are increasing. Along with reducing social payments, the bourgeois state is more and more actively supporting monopoly capital during class conflicts, resorting to direct suppression of strike actions of the working class and expanding the sphere of application of anti-trade union legislation. And they are no longer preaching that the bourgeois state is supposed to be a "neutral arbiter."

The openly pro-monopoly orientation of the social policies of the ruling circles in the leading capitalist countries in recent years has finally dispelled the myth of capitalism's transformation into a "universal welfare state" and once again confirmed the truth of Lenin's evaluation of the class essence of state monopoly capitalism.

It must be noted that the policy of reducing expenditures for social needs has a serious effect on the material position of the groups of working people who are most discriminated against, above all, the families of the unemployed. With the general increase in unemployment in recent years, the structure of unemployment has significantly changed through an increase in the "stagnant" nucleus -- workers and employees who do not work for long periods of time. In the "Common Market" countries, more than 40 percent of the unemployed have not worked for more than a year. Most of them have lost the right to receive unemployment benefits. The situation which has presently developed in the work force market confirms that present systems of social insurance for unemployment are unable to prevent the process of pauperization of a substantial part of the unemployed.

But the ruling circles of capitalist countries obviously assume that the unemployed receive too much and under conditions that are too special. Only this can account for the fact that rules for paying unemployment benefits are becoming stricter throughout the capitalist world (the length of labor service needed to receive benefits is being increased, daily registration at the labor exchange is being required, unemployed people must agree to a reduction in their occupational status, and so forth), while in a number of countries the amounts of benefits themselves are being reduced or taxed. In this way, the scope of contemporary pauperism is being increased.

Along with the unemployed, people who work in low-paying occupations, young people, and elderly working people are adding to the army of the poor. Even the officially recognized scope of pauperism has substantially increased in all capitalist countries. In the United States the number of people with incomes lower than the official poverty level increased by 6 million from 1980 through 1984 and totals 35 million people -- 15.2 percent of the entire population.⁵ In France 6 million people -- 12 percent of the entire population -- have incomes lower than the officially established poverty level. In Great Britain in the crisis years (1979-1983) the number of poor people doubled from 2 million to 4 million people; in the FRG, according to the estimate of the social democrats, poor people account for one-fifth the population. In the EEC countries as a whole, 13 percent of the entire population are poor people.

Apologists of capitalism try to prove that current poverty is completely "proper" and that thanks to a developed system of social security poor people endure no particular hardships. Nonetheless, a significant part of the population of even the richest capitalist country -- the United States -- can with complete justification be called starving. Senator E. Kennedy called his report published in late 1983 just that -- "Starving America." The report notes that in 1983 alone the number of people needing food stamps doubled and in certain regions -- quadrupled. The number of illnesses related to malnutrition rose by almost 25 percent. Because of the increased scope of

poverty in recent years in the countries of the West, it is not superfluous to recall how many spears bourgeois theoreticians have broken distorting Marxist positions on the absolute and relative impoverishment of the proletariat. The present time has once again confirmed that the absolute impoverishment of certain detachments of the working class in periods of crisis is a fully proven fact.

As for the entire working class, the statement formulated by F. Engels' remains applicable to it: "Organization of workers and their steadily growing opposition will where possible create a certain barrier to the /growth of poverty/. But what is definitely growing is the /lack of the means of existence/" [phrases enclosed in slantlines are printed in italics in text].⁶

The increasing lack of the means of existence is a result of the increased gap between the growing range of needs of working people and the potential to satisfy them. The increase in needs is a permanent process which is a natural consequence of the increased level of education and general sophistication of the new generations of hired workers. Thus, of the total number of people employed in the economy in the United States, the proportion of people with higher education (graduates of 4-year colleges and universities) increased in 1970-1983 from 14 percent to 24 percent. In this same period the proportion of working people with less than 8 years education declined from 36 to 17.8 percent.⁷

Similar processes of increasing the average level of education of working people are also occurring in other capitalist countries. The level of needs of the working class is steadily growing and the level of needs and expectations of young people is particularly increasing. The range of needs of the hired worker in present conditions has been substantially expanded through increased demands regarding housing and its appointments and the set of essential durable goods has increased. We must include here, too, full-fledged recreation and the need to provide an education for one's children. But the expanding range of needs can only be satisfied -- taking into account the decline in real earnings -- by increasing the number of people working in each family. It is noteworthy that in the United States 40 percent of married women worked in 1960 but in 1981 the corresponding indicator was already 62.4 percent. This fact confirms that the earnings of the head of the American family are no longer sufficient to satisfy its daily needs.

Acquaintance with actual reality in the capitalist world shows that on the whole economic and social conditions of the life of working people in recent years have significantly worsened. But for all its importance, one must not confine oneself to this conclusion alone. A more detailed analysis should undoubtedly reveal a more complex and contradictory picture. In addition, there are a number of fundamentally new phenomena which require the elaboration and development of theoretical positions.

Without aspiring to a exhaustive analysis of this type of phenomenon, in this article we will only point out some of them which require further study. Among the first is the question of the inequality of economic development of capitalist countries in present conditions and of the fact that this inequality is reflected in the position of the working class in particular

countries. When the situations in the United States, the countries of Western Europe, and Japan are compared, it becomes apparent that the Western European countries had the most difficulty enduring the economic upheavals of the last 10 years. Their rate of economic growth declined most sharply, the structural crisis encompassed a larger number of sectors and reached a greater depth than in the United States and Japan, and the intensity of scientific-technical progress and the structural reorganization of the economy in them was much much lower. The competitive positions of Western European monopolies on the world market also substantially worsened, especially as compared to the positions of Japanese monopolies. Accordingly, the situation in the employment sphere in this region is also much worse. Here are the concrete facts: while in the United States in 1976-1983 the total number of jobs rose by 14.7 million and in Japan -- by 4.4 million, in the countries of Western Europe with a substantially larger population, the number of jobs declined by 1 million. And in a number of Western European countries the process of general decline in the employment rate has been accelerating since the beginning of the 1980's. In mid-1984 the number of people employed was 8 percent less than in 1980 in France and Spain, 5 percent -- in the FRG and Great Britain, and 1-2 percent -- in Italy and Switzerland.

The number of jobs in industry is declining at an especially rapid rate in Western European countries. In 1976-1981 on the whole in industry in countries of Western Europe, 2 million jobs were eliminated and then, in the less than 3 years from 1982 through the fourth quarter of 1984 upwards of 2.5 million more jobs were eliminated. It must be noted that a downturn in industrial employment was also noted in the United States but there, in the first place, it was not so considerable and, in the second place, it was overlapped by a substantial increase in the employment rate in the service sphere.

The question arises: how far can the process of "deindustrialization" of Western Europe go? Is it mainly a result of the rationalization of production or the policies of Western European monopolies which are increasingly oriented to exporting capital beyond the borders of the Western European region? Can Western Europe repeat the path of the United States -- create a significant number of new jobs in the service sphere? An evaluation of prospects in the employment sphere is extremely important for developing the strategy of the Western European workers movement, which has an enormous amount of historical experience in class struggle but is now set in rather complicated conditions.

Further. The consequences of changes in the sectorial and occupational structure of employment is a problem requiring further analysis. As was already noted above, the industrial employment rate of most capitalist countries is declining but in the service sphere employment is increasing. As for factory-plant workers, in such sectors as metallurgy and the automotive and other machine building sectors, the number of people employed has declined substantially in recent years, especially in the crisis period of 1980-1982. Some of them, but by no means all, returned to their former jobs after the crisis ended. Thus, according to data of a survey by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), in the 5-year period of 1979-1983, 11.5 million hired workers over 20 years of age lost their jobs as a result of the closing of enterprises and elimination of jobs: of these, 5.1 million people had already

worked at least 3 years. At the start of 1984, 1.3 million of these workers continued to be out of work, 600,000 had left the labor market, and of the 3.1 million people who had once again found work, 1.75 million were forced to take worse jobs with lower pay.⁹

A survey of the unemployed conducted in France showed that of men who had again found work in October 1983, 47 percent managed to find a job in industry or construction, while 52 percent of the total number of those surveyed were engaged in these sectors before they were let go. This process is even more marked with women: before they lost their jobs, 65 percent of them were employed in the service sphere; of the total number who once again found work, 76 percent found positions in the service sphere.

Of course, this shift in the work force is to a certain extent the result of consequences of the 1980-1982 crisis. But one can hardly count on fundamental changes in the trends noted, even taking into account the possible restoration of the production volume in the sectors mentioned above and in manufacturing industry as a whole. According to the "super-optimistic" prognosis of the American BLS, by the mid-1990's the number of people employed in the automotive and metallurgical industries will be many times less than in the years preceding the 1980-1982 crisis.

A large part of semiskilled workers as well as some of the skilled workers who have lost their jobs in recent years are unlikely to find work in new sectors which are the vanguard of scientific-technical progress (computer production, calculating and computing equipment, electronics, and so forth). Despite the high rate of their development, their demand for work force is not so great: according to the prognosis of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics already mentioned above, they will account for 30 percent of all new jobs in the period 1983-1985. And there will mainly be a need for engineers, technicians, and very highly skilled workers.

So, in a sectorial breakdown further concentration of employment at two poles is possible in the future: at the smaller of them -- in a limited circle of the most high-technology sectors, employment will increase absolutely and relatively, insuring those working in this sector higher earnings and a more developed system of social security and so forth. The other pole, much larger in size, is the service sphere, where unstable employment, low wages, poor labor conditions and so on prevail.

This process leads to numerous negative consequences for working people. The stereotype of employment in the worker family which developed where the head of the family -- the man -- could work in one of the sectors of material production where high wages predominate while low-paying work in the service sphere was mainly the lot of women and young people has changed. Now an increasing number of men -- former metallurgy workers, automotive workers, and machine tool operators -- are forced to accept low-paying work in the service sphere.

As for the consequences of the above-mentioned process on the worker movement, it must be taken into account that the positions of those trade unions (of metallurgical workers, printers, and automotive workers) which were commonly

pioneers in the struggle to expand social gains and whose achievements in this struggle served as a reference point and stimulus for all other detachments of the working class are weakened. Therefore, the weakening of the positions of these detachments of the worker movement has a negative effect on the trade union movement as a whole and necessitates the development of an efficient program for reorganizing the trade union movement and the adoption of countermeasures against the strategy of monopolies aimed at undermining trade unions.

Yet another problem related to sectorial and occupational changes in the employment structure is the prospects for workers of low-skilled and nonskilled labor. As it seems to us, when the possible development of the scientific-technical revolution was analyzed in the 1960's, there was a certain underestimation of the continuing need for simple labor. The experience of the past 2 decades has shown that the development of the scientific-technical revolution had not yet led, and to all appearances will not lead in the foreseeable future, to the disappearance of a significant group of occupations involving low-skilled and nonskilled labor. The experience of the United States convincingly affirms this: in the period 1970-1982 the number of nonskilled workers continued to grow. The potential opportunities for an increase in the number of low-skilled workers confirms that researchers who think that the development of the scientific-technical revolution is inseparably linked with the replacement of simple work force by complex work force are somewhat simplifying the actual processes.

It seems that certain methodological errors have been made in this question because the question of the historical evolution of the simple and complex work force has not been completely elaborated theoretically. Can there be a change in the quality of the work force or its "scope," which is then used to measure the complex work force and remains invariable. Further theoretical elaboration of the question is needed here. It is also wrong to draw the conclusion that the complexity of the work force increases based on the dynamics of growth in the educational level. This level does not increase merely as a result of the growth of production's direct needs for workers. General education also has autonomous stimuli not directly related to the particular stage of scientific-technical progress.

One must not forget that the lure of culture and knowledge is an organic element of the entire process of increasing the needs of the popular masses. In conditions of capitalism a higher level of education is also envisioned as a major prerequisite of social mobility and in recent years -- in connection with increased unemployment -- a kind of guarantee of stable future work and living standard. Therefore, the social demand for education, whose dimensions overall exceed the actual needs of the capitalist economy, increases. As a result, a "devaluation" of diplomas takes place while the knowledge and skill of the young generation of hired workers is underused. In the United States alone, according to present evaluations, several million specialists are used in jobs not requiring higher education, and the size of this group is increasing steadily. The ruling circles of capitalist countries take advantage of the situation which has developed in the sphere of higher education, in particular, the problem of "overproduction of specialists" as yet another pretext for reducing state expenditures for stipends and loans to

students from low-income families. So in this way the elitist principles of organizing education are beginning to be restored in bourgeois society. Ultimately this attests to the deterioration of the position of working people in yet another aspect which is important to them and above all touches the interests of the younger generation.

In this connection I would like to note the need for more detailed study of the position of hired workers both in individual stages of their life cycle (that is, the study of changes in the position of generations during their lives) and the positions of various age groups of working people in certain periods. This more detailed research would make it possible to avoid too much averaging in evaluations of the position of working people as a whole.

Yet another complicated question is the evaluation of demographic processes presently occurring in the countries of developed capitalism. We mean the trend of depopulation which has been observed -- a direct decline in the size of the population or a decline in the relative indicators of the birthrate to a level which, if maintained, would in the future lead to a decline in the size of the population (without taking migration into account). This process has acquired the most obvious forms in the FRG where the size of the German population declined in 1973-1982 by 1.2 million people, and if the present coefficients of the birthrate are maintained, a further decline in the size of the population from 61 million in 1983 to 48 million by the year 2010 will occur and by the year 2030 -- to 38 million people.¹⁰ In the United States, if the present relative indicators of the birthrate are maintained (an average of 2 children per family), an absolute decline in the size of the population is probable in the future (if legal immigration is maintained at the present level).

The "demographic shift" taking place -- the orientation toward families with few children and no children -- is a multilevel phenomenon whose analysis goes beyond the confines of this article. But one cannot fail to note the role of economic factors in the development of this process. The sharp increase in expenditures for children recorded by statistics has not been reflected in a similar growth in the incomes of a large part of the population, including in most families of working people. In the situation which has arisen in connection with this, refusal to have children is in many respects a decision brought about by economic circumstances. In our opinion, this gives reason to consider the process of depopulation in developed capitalist countries as yet another, new form of the manifestation of the deterioration of the position of working people.

Finally, the last of the problems to which I would like to turn attention (but by no means the last in importance) is the obvious need to study the quantitative parameters of the exploitation of the working class, taking into account the latest data, changes in the class structure of capitalist countries, the dynamics of the norm of surplus value, and a careful analysis of the redistribution of national income through the tax mechanism and the system of social payments. Contemporary neoconservatives try to attract a certain part of the working class with relatively high earnings to their side, asserting that the policy of "social dismantling" is to restore the stimulus to work in poor people and correspondingly reduce the tax burden of those who

are working. In this way, the real nature of the redistribution of national income being implemented is masked and as a result monopoly capital is the only winning side. Existing data on this process allows a summary quantitative evaluation of the increased exploitation of the working class.

Obviously, all the problems which were spoken of above and those which were not mentioned here ultimately represent various sides of the development of capitalism. In connection with this, the question arises: to what degree do the processes characteristic of capitalism in the last 10 years or so give reason to speak of a new qualitative condition of this system? All representatives of Marxist-Leninist science agree that a major exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism occurred during this period and that the changes are the most fundamental in the entire postwar period.

In an interesting article published in the newspaper PRAVDA on 9 May 1983,¹¹ S.M. Menshikov posed the extremely important question of whether contemporary state monopoly capitalism has entered a new stage of its development which can be characterized as "transnational capitalism." And Menshikov gave a system of arguments to prove this thesis, the idea of which amounts to a change in the role of transnational corporations in the economy and policies of contemporary capitalism.

In this case we are not making a statement on the essential points of the viewpoint advanced. Undoubtedly, it requires a more detailed and comprehensive discussion by Marxist social scientists which must more precisely define the essential characteristics of capitalism's evolution as a system and the criteria which are the basis for the periodization of capitalism's socioeconomic development. Only then can we avoid advancing varied and incompatible criteria as the substantiation for capitalism's move from one stage of development to another. But I would like to support Menshikov's initiative in advancing such an important question for all Marxist social scientists: an analysis of the role of transnational corporations in the world economy, politics, and social relations, especially since at the present time the processes of concentration and centralization of capital are by no means unambiguous.

The unquestionable increase in the role of transnational corporations appears alongside what in the West received the name of the "crisis of the large enterprise" or the "renaissance of small business," that is, the increased proportion of small and medium-sized enterprises in social production. These enterprises try to find an "ecological niche" for themselves in the differentiation and specialization of production which continues at a rapid rate. A new type of relations between monopolies and the nonmonopoly sector arises; behind them are relations between the monopoly and petty and middle bourgeoisie in contemporary capitalist society, as well as relations between various detachments of the working class to some extent.

In conclusion I would like to again emphasize the role in the development of social thought of such a proven, useful means of stimulating the process of learning as scientific debates.

The journal RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR has already repeatedly offered its pages for debates on the most diverse topics. Here one could mention the discussion of such complex, debated problems as change in the value of the work force in the present epoch, the boundaries and concept of the working class, the features of capitalism of the 1970's--early 1980's, changes in the structure of the working class, and so forth. I hope that this fine tradition continues to develop in the future.

Returning to the initial premises of our analysis, let us recall the famous Leninist statement that "a miraculous prophecy is a fairy tale. But scientific prophecy is fact."¹² There is no doubt that Soviet social scientists, relying on Marxist-Leninist doctrine, can successfully perform the tasks facing them: to theoretically generalize new phenomena in contemporary capitalism and give a prognosis of the future development of the international class struggle.

FOOTNOTES

1. MEIMO, No 3, 1985, p 70.
2. ECONOMIE ET POLITIQUE, No 82, 1984, p 41.
3. MEIMO, No 3, 1985, p 66.
4. R. Grazia, "Le travail clandestin. Situation dans le pays industrialises a economie de marche" [The Underground Industry. The Situation in the Industrial Countries and the Reverse Economy], Geneva, 1983, p 13.
5. SShA -- EKONOMIKA, POLITIKA, IDEOLOGIYA, No 5, 1985, p 57.
6. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Sochineniya" [Works], Vol 22, p 233.
7. Cited from: "Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1982-1983," p 146.
8. "Main Economic Indicators 1985," April, p 19.
9. ECONOMIC NOTES, No 12, 1984, p 10.
10. PROBLEMES ECONOMIQUES, Paris, No 1860, 1984, pp 5-6.
11. See also: KOMMUNIST, No 6, 1983, pp 33-47.
12. V.I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniya" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 36, p 472.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

WORLD WAR II LESSONS APPLIED TO PRESENT

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 14-27

[Article by Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, doctor of philosophical sciences and professor: "The Victory Over Fascism in World War II and the International Workers Movement"; passages enclosed in slantlines printed in italics]

[Excerpts] This year all of progressive mankind marked a great historical anniversary, the 40th anniversary of victory over fascism. But it was the working class and its revolutionary parties and trade unions who celebrated this jubilee with a special feeling, with a legitimate pride in the unfading feats of war heroes, and with an unwavering determination to defend the high ideals of peace and progress. And this is understandable. For the international working class was -- if we may put it in this way -- a leading actor in the struggle against fascism, and this means in the entire world war. Its role and influence on the course of events and on social development as a whole grew progressively during all the war years -- and both quantitatively and qualitatively.

/Everywhere the working class acted as the main force of struggle against fascism. It was the first to rise in defense of the national interests, independence, and very existence of its countries. Everywhere it was the main carrier of liberation and democratic trends and the main social force that insured the just liberating character of the war./

Despite heavy losses, the number of workers in the world increased during the war years from 200 to 250 million (primarily in colonial countries and in the Western Hemisphere). The social-psychological changes that took place during the war years in the awareness of the working class and in the awareness of the many millions of working people who participated in the general struggle against fascism were of immense importance.

Everywhere the consciousness of the working class rose noticeably. Its faith in its own strengths and in its ability to make an important contribution toward accomplishing currently important national tasks and to achieve real successes in the struggle for a democratic and social transformation of society was bolstered. The level of workers' international consciousness was also raised and, in particular, their understanding of the inviolable link between the life and struggle of the working people in the West and the

successes of socialism and of the need to strengthen solidarity with the Soviet people, with the working class that is building socialism, became more widespread. On the whole all this led in the postwar years to the working class' greater influence on the life of its countries and on international development.

Thus it has been most convincingly reaffirmed: /It is precisely the working class which in our age represents society's vital and creative force, its most active social element, and the carrier of the progressive trends of social development./

During the postwar decades the class opponents of the proletariat have done everything in their power to lower the level of consciousness and organization of the working people and weaken their fighting effectiveness. Various splitting maneuvers of the 1940's and 1950's, the ideology and politics of the "consumer society," and the efforts to integrate the working class into the state-monopoly society and to depoliticize it were subordinated to this goal. Quite a great deal was also done to undermine and weaken the internationalist consciousness of workers and, above all, the close spiritual ties of the working people of capitalist countries with the peoples of the socialist countries. However, state-monopoly capital failed to achieve its goals to the extent that it would have liked to achieve them. The role of the working class as the gravedigger of capitalism and builder of a new society, which has been fully preserved and is conditioned by its social nature and the essence of contemporary capitalism, represents the main objective obstacle to the policy of undermining the working class. This role has not only been preserved but is also growing in potential as a result of the growing education and higher qualification of workers and their stronger link with the scientific-technical progress of our time; as a result of socialism's manifest demonstration of the working class' creative potential; and as a result of the deepening contradictions of bourgeois society and the steadily progressing revelation of the anti-people nature of contemporary capitalism and of the obvious danger that its existence poses to the very life of mankind.

As has been said above, the role of the working class is "growing in potential." It is known that the objective growth of its possibilities is by no means always adequately reflected in practical activities. In extreme conditions, similar to those created by World War II, this growth would perhaps again manifest itself with truly explosive force. However, now, in the nuclear missile age, it is simply impossible to permit the rise of such extreme conditions. Today we must mobilize the working class and its potential resources /before/ such extreme conditions develop, in order to preclude their development. And what is in particular needed for this purpose is more thorough and precise exposure of the working class' potential by Marxist-Leninist science and a decisive rebuff to all systems of ideas based on diminishing the role and potential of the proletariat.

This should be remembered especially in view of the fact that a certain underestimation of the role of the working class accompanied by a simultaneous overestimation of the role of the intelligentsia (attention to which, certainly, cannot be lessened) and of the role of the new middle strata (Marxists are called on to increase attention to them as well) has also been

observed in certain detachments of the communist movement in recent years. A strange picture is sometimes created: the class enemy feels more acutely and reacts more effectively and efficiently to the growth of the proletariat's potential than some comrades and some communists.

It seems that science, including scientists of the socialist countries and their cooperation with the Marxist scientists of foreign states, should play a significant role in overcoming this shortcoming, this weakness fraught with great dangers.

If during the years of World War II the working class was able to play the role that it did, then this was conditioned to an enormous extent by the activities of its organized vanguard, above all the communist parties.

/The communists and the international communist movement as a whole were the greatest and most active and consistently organized political force of the antifascist struggle./

Essentially, the communists were the first and, for a long time, the only organized political force who developed the struggle against fascism and against the Hitlerite occupiers in Western Europe. The communists were subjected to cruel persecution. They suffered heavy losses in the struggle against the enemy. But they were active during the entire war in the vanguard of resistance fighters. They organized the first armed resistance groups and detachments, which subsequently grew into partisan groups and detachments and, in Yugoslavia for example, into a regular army. They inspired the fighters against fascism and set them an example of steadfastness and selflessness.

History does not tolerate the subjunctive mood. But let us nevertheless imagine what would have happened if the communists had failed to fulfill their role during the war years. It is perfectly clear that in that event the Day of Victory might have been delayed and, the main thing in this connection, the historical fates of the peoples both in the East and in the West might have turned out quite differently. Any weakening of the communists' role in that difficult period would have only played into the hands of the class enemy, contributed to the implementation of his plans, and slowed down the development of the liberation struggle of peoples.

The lessons of the initial period of the war also have major significance for the communist movement in our day. Above all they show convincingly how important it is to see the real sources of militarism and aggression clearly and to wage a purposeful struggle against them by concentrating on repulsing the more aggressive and reactionary circles of the imperialist world.

It is well known that even now extensive debates are conducted on these questions. The task is clear to the Marxist-Leninists and the Marxist-Leninist parties: to concentrate their fire against the aggressive circles, including American imperialism above all, and to show the responsibility of the United States and NATO for the current tension and the increased threat of war. This is a reliable way to mobilize the masses and prevent war. However, many people who are politically inexperienced or deceived by imperialist propaganda still vacillate and cannot find the correct orientation. The class

enemy and aggressive circles in the West take advantage of this situation and try to propagandize the thesis of the "equal responsibility" of imperialism and socialism for the present dangerous development of international relations. This thesis is very harmful because it disorients the champions of peace and deprives them of opportunities to deal effective blows against those who are really to blame for the confrontation and arms race.

The following, however, is worth noting: while objectively it is an extremely harmful maneuver, the propounding by imperialism and its propaganda of the theory of "equal responsibility" of socialism and imperialism for the arms race still reflects a certain moral defeat for imperialist forces. Let us recall: we know that initially the West tried hard to instill in the consciousness of the masses a fear of the "threat from the East," of the "Soviet military threat." However, although this propaganda maneuver had quite a broad effect on certain strata, still it failed to gain acceptance among the broad popular masses. The idea of the "equal responsibility" of socialism and capitalism for the exacerbation of international tension was put forward as a sort of compromise under precisely these conditions.

Regrettably, this idea also gained certain popularity among a particular part of democratic circles, including -- toward the late 1970's -- some communist parties. This circumstance was indisputably of a negative character. And in this connection it must be stressed that our attitude toward the people promoting this thesis cannot always be the same. If those who had previously unreservedly supported the thesis of the "Soviet military threat" (as, for example, many social democratic parties and organizations) have now changed to the position of "equal responsibility" of the sides, then this is progress as far as they are concerned although, of course, it is insufficient progress. If, however, the forces that had previously quite justifiably borne witness precisely to imperialism's responsibility for the present situation, then, as far as they are concerned, this represents a step, and a major step at that, backward, a step that cannot fail to provoke a corresponding reaction.

The lessons of the initial period of the war for communists also include the fact that they must see the different programs and political nuances in the bourgeois and imperialist camp and perceive the difference between openly aggressive forces and bourgeois democratic forces with a more realistic view of the development of the situation. This is no less important today than in 1939-1940; perhaps it is even more important today. This is true because today the delimitation between these forces in the West is manifestly more noticeable and the main thing -- because what is involved today is the question of preventing nuclear war, that is, the question of a totally new situation where it is especially important to utilize all opportunities to achieve the desired goal. Today it is especially important, and not only for the communists of socialist countries which conduct state policy but also for the communist parties of bourgeois states to know against which forces a decisive and uncompromising struggle must be waged and which forces can be neutralized or in certain conditions act as allies in the antiwar struggle.

Considered as a whole, the experience accumulated by the communist movement during World War II is also of exceptional interest today, considering the

particular characteristics of our time and the present international class struggle. What are the main lessons from that experience?

/First,/ the implementation of the strategic course of the communist parties during the war and its unquestionable success fully confirmed the validity of the communists' orientation toward /developing the struggle for peace and democracy by uniting all progressive, democratic, and peace-loving forces,/ the orientation that was first elaborated by V.I. Lenin. The experience of postwar development and, in particular, the experience of recent years, which have been marked by the unprecedented scope of the antiwar struggle of peoples, have once again confirmed that under conditions of contemporary capitalism a policy of broad unity is the most fruitful one and the one that in practice insures success in the struggle for peace and democracy. The popular movements and the antiwar movements achieve successes wherever this policy is consistently followed. But wherever elements of sectarianism prevail, it is considerably more difficult to achieve such successes.

/Secondly,/ the lessons on the communists' implementation of their strategic line during World War II confirm the significance of the communist parties' policy aimed at achieving maximum realization of the potential of the working class. There is no doubt that the future social development of the capitalist world will depend to an enormous and growing extent on whether the communists and the left-wing forces succeed in realizing the working class' potential and in directing its energy to the struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism. Precisely the /working class is expected/ today, too -- and to an even greater extent than yesterday -- /to represent the basis of broad democratic unity and the main force and backbone of that unity/. All other social groups and strata can only manifest their democratic potentials to the extent that they unite their efforts with the efforts of the proletariat.

/Thirdly,/ the lessons of the war convincingly attest to the significance of strengthening the communist parties themselves as the basis of the activities of the entire working class and as a decisive factor of anti-imperialist and antiwar unity. This lesson has been fully confirmed by the subsequent experience of 40 years and, in particular, by the experience of the coalition of left-wing forces in France. Unfortunately, it must be noted that vacillations and inconsistency in regard to this problem are still apparent in some cases. Thus, for example, it is known that now and then attempts have been or are still made to promote the idea of the need for communists to renounce their vanguard role in the democratic and antiwar movement and, moreover, transform the communist parties from militant Marxist-Leninist organizations into some kind of "enlightenment alliances" or into broad coalitions of left-wing forces. This approach, which can only be called a liquidation approach, can only lead to one thing: depriving the working class of its fighting vanguard and, consequently, greatly weakening its potential.

However, a certain kind of nihilism in regard to the communist parties and their role more often manifests itself in the approach to the problems of the international communist movement as a whole. There have been attempts to deny that any such movement exists at all. Now and then it is possible to hear claims that the activities of communists as an independent political force in the international arena and, in particular, in the antiwar struggle are

allegedly harmful since, it is said, they can weaken the antiwar front and drive other political forces away from participating in this front. The World War II experience provides one of the strongest arguments against this position.

The strengthening of the role of communist parties and of the entire communist movement and their position in world development represent one of the most important tasks of contemporary times, a task that has been substantiated and fully confirmed by the lessons of the last war and the lessons of the Resistance Movement.

/Fourthly/, an important lesson of the war, which reveals the secret of success of any revolutionary strategy, is the importance of a constant and uninterrupted link between the current and the long-term task and a simultaneous coordination of these tasks with the ultimate goal of the working class. It is precisely this link of the tasks of the antifascist struggle with the tasks of a profoundly democratic and subsequently social transformation of society which insured the success of the people's democratic revolutions and -- wherever it was impossible to carry them out -- the successes of the working class in its struggle for its own interests in the first postwar years.

This problem continues to retain all its significance in our time, too. It is obviously possible to say even more: in our time, when the objective prerequisites and the objective needs for profound social transformations have reached a much higher stage of maturity than 40 years ago, closely coordinating the current and long-term tasks of the working class is even more necessary and, at the same time, even more fruitful. And it is by no means an accident that the present strategy of Marxist-Leninist parties is built precisely on the basis of closely coordinating the problems of today's struggle with long-term revolutionary and socialist prospects. But no success should be expected in those cases where such coordination is lacking and the struggle is based on the principle that "the main thing is to move forward -- where to move will become clear later" or when revolution-oriented strategy is replaced by transitory tactical calculations.

At the same time, it also continues to be true today that any attempts to jump over the objectively necessary stages of the struggle and ignore the objectively conditioned succession of these stages or to confuse them (and again this is fraught with the danger of artificially slowing down movement or of running ahead too quickly) -- and approaches of this kind are encountered even today -- definitely cannot lead to success. And what is involved is not only success in the cause of achieving the present goals of the working class. For the question of stages and steps of development of the revolutionary process is not a purely academic and theoretical problem but a profoundly practical problem as well. After all, in this case we are speaking of assessing the disposition of class forces and determining the composition of alliances and allies. To confuse stages or to run ahead can alienate possible allies from the working class and alienate them for now and for the future. In contrast, a precise determination of the paths and stages of the revolutionary process most effectively promotes the education of the broad masses in the spirit of the struggle for democracy and socialism.

Finally, /fifthly,/ the experience of the war confirmed with new force the importance of proletarian internationalism as a powerful weapon of the working class in the struggle for its democratic and socialist goals and in the struggle to fulfill both the national and international tasks of the working class.

It is well known that many debates are also being conducted on this question. Sometimes the role of proletarian internationalism is denied or at least questioned. It is contrasted with some different type of internationalism, some limitless nonclass union of heterogeneous social and political forces where the working class seems to dissolve and loses its identity. There is no doubt that the broad international unification of left-wing, democratic, and antiwar forces is an indispensable task. And, as we have already said, the experience of World War II shows this. But that same experience also demonstrated something else: the internationalism of the proletariat and the unification of its class forces do not represent an obstacle to but a prerequisite for accomplishing the task of forming a broader front of all democratic peace-loving forces and of all those who are today able to act against imperialism and for the peace and freedom of peoples.

It was not only the communists who were tested during the war years. The social democrats also underwent a major test. And it must be stated directly that the results of that test were by no means uniform for them.

In the prewar years, after wrecking the unity of the working class and renouncing cooperation with the communists, the social democrats made it easier for imperialism to unleash the war. In the initial period of the war until the USSR's entry into it, the social democrats continued the infamous traditions of the Second International and adopted an essentially social-patriotic position. Moreover, the Labor Party in England, the French Socialists, and other leading parties of the Second International proclaimed their unreserved support of plans to shift the war to an anti-Soviet track, plans nurtured in England, France, and the United States. But when fascism launched its offensive in 1940, which resulted in quick capitulations of a number of West European countries, the leaders of a majority of socialist parties either fell into a state of confusion or embarked on an openly traitorous path. For example, in France a considerable part of the socialist deputies voted in 1940 in favor of handing power over to the traitor Petain. All this led to a new collapse of the Second International similar to what had occurred in the years of World War I. The Second International in fact ceased to exist after France's capitulation.

The development of the Resistance Movement understandably could not leave rank-and-file socialists, above all those belonging to the working class, indifferent. Rank-and-file socialists began to participate in the Resistance Movement together with communists. This gradually led to the underground revival of socialist and social-democratic organizations, but now on a new, antifascist basis.

Under conditions of the struggle against fascism, there began in the underground a process of gradual restoration or adjustment, depending on the

conditions of the particular countries, of the actual unity of action of the two basic political currents of the workers movement, primarily at lower levels, among rank-and-file communists and socialists. To a great degree this was a positive, progressive process.

While in the postwar period socialist and social-democratic parties in the countries of continental Europe managed to reestablish themselves and gain considerable influence, this occurred only because they had participated in the Resistance Movement and in particular had acted there in a united front with the communists. It was precisely due to this fact that the socialist parties were able to gain a certain authority among the masses. In the first postwar years the number of voters for socialists and social democrats in Western Europe increased to a total of 35 million, as compared with 21 million in the prewar years. In those years the labor, socialist, and Social Democratic Parties became the ruling parties in Great Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands, not to mention the Scandinavian countries where they had already held leading positions for a long time.

From the standpoint of mutual relations between the two basic trends in the workers movement, the lessons of the war period have retained all of their significance to this day. As far as the communists are concerned, they have generally learned these lessons and act by striving for unity of action or for parallel actions with the socialist and social democratic parties, above all in the antiwar struggle. Nonetheless, it cannot be said that the social democrats and socialists have duly drawn the appropriate lessons from that experience. To be sure, by the mid-1970's a certain reorientation began among social democrats primarily in relation to questions on the struggle against the threat of war. Their positions on these questions moved closer to the positions of the communist movement. On a practical level the Socialist International and its member-parties acted more and more frequently by coordinating their efforts to a certain extent with the communist parties of the socialist countries. However, an essentially anticomunist course continues to be followed in relation to the communist parties in their own states.

Moreover, it can be said that the social democrats often strive to utilize a certain leftward swing in their positions to more effectively compete with the communists and to try to take away their audience and their electoral base.

This should be a lesson to the communists. On the one hand it is necessary to continue the struggle for the unity of the working class and for interaction between its political parties, and on the other, to persistently protect their own interests in a principled way, strengthen the positions of their own parties, and place major emphasis on achieving cooperation with the socialists from below, without, of course, excluding possible agreements at top levels. This course is best able to insure the formation of a unified worker front in the struggle for the vital goals facing the working class.

During the war years major processes also developed in the trade union movement, especially in the countries which had fallen under Hitler's occupation. The old reformist trade unions of the prewar period virtually ceased to exist under the conditions of underground work. Then a process of

gradual revival of the trade union movement began, a revival based on participation in the antifascist struggle and in the Resistance Movement. The trade unions in which the communists had the greatest influence were the first to begin to restore their forces. These trade unions essentially also became the centers of revival of the trade union movement as a whole as well as centers for arranging contacts among different trade union organizations. What was involved in a number of cases was the formation of single unitary trade unions. Following emergence from the underground, the trade unions began to quickly restore themselves and achieved a much higher degree of organization than ever before. Their rapid growth then continued both in the former occupied countries and in the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition.

The fact that a strong aspiration to form an international trade union organization developed among the masses during the war years and the early postwar period is also of enormous importance. That process began with the formation of the British-Soviet Trade Union Committee in December 1941. And then in 1945 at a conference in Paris the World Trade Union Federation was founded, a federation which initially represented 67 million workers affiliated with 65 national and 86 international organizations. This was an important landmark in the history of the trade union movement.

The 40th anniversary of the Great Victory gives us reason to recall the glorious traditions of the war period, which called for unity in the trade union movement, and the unity of actions of trade unions of different orientations. And it is understandable that the slogan of joint struggle to prevent a new war is the main slogan of such a movement in our day. Some progress in this direction was made in the 1970's and the early 1980's. It immediately affected the development of the antiwar struggle. However, those things which have been accomplished are only the first steps and should certainly be further developed and deepened.

World War II represented a serious ordeal for peoples and above all for the working class of all countries. The working class passed that historic trial with honor.

The fact that socialism played the decisive role in achieving victory in the mortal struggle against fascism was the main factor which determined the strengthened positions of the working class during the war years and the postwar period. The USSR's victory over Hitler's Germany and its allies was a victory of the socialist social and state system and of its policies and ideology. It is precisely this circumstance which insured the victory of the working class and instilled new energy into it.

And in the future, too, the fate of the international worker movement will in many respects be determined by the progress of socialism and its successes in the cause of building and perfecting the new society in peaceful competition with capitalism. Hence the enormous responsibility that falls on the working class, communists, and all peoples of the socialist world. The Soviet people and the CPSU clearly recognize their responsibility and are doing everything necessary to accelerate our country's progress along the road determined by the 26th party congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, especially the extraordinary March and April 1985 Central Committee plenums.

The lessons of World War II and the lessons of the antifascist struggle of the working class, communists, and all its other detachments have retained all their importance even to our day.

It is understandable that during the past 40 years the working class everywhere in the world has changed, and changed fundamentally. Its ranks have grown. Its structure has changed. The particular forms of its work and social activity have changed. The views and level of consciousness of some of its detachments have changed in many respects and by no means in the same way. But what has not changed is the essence of its historical mission. Moreover, the significance of the proletariat's social activity and its class struggle is much greater now than in the past. The tasks facing the proletariat have become even larger in scope. And of course, first among these tasks is the task of preventing a new world war.

The working class, communists of all countries, and, in many cases, socialists and social democrats along with them observed the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory not only as a day for remembering the heroes of the antifascist battles but also as a day of struggle to solve the pressing present-day problems of the worker movement, and above all as a day of struggle against the threat of war and against militarism and imperialist reaction.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION MOVEMENT, IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE VIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 28-36

[Article by Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Subbotin, Secretary of the AUCCTU: "On the Question of the Ideological Struggle in the International Trade Union Movement"; passages enclosed in slantlines printed in italics]

[Text] History attests to the fact that the international trade union movement has been in the thick of the ideological struggle for the entire period of its existence. The bourgeoisie has tried and is trying to impose its own social and ideological concepts on the working class, and to knock it off the path of class struggle toward reformism and conciliation. It has striven and is striving by all means and methods to demoralize and push back the workers movement and isolate its front-rank detachments.

The heterogeneity of the composition of the working people and the dissimilarity in the material position, education level, and access to culture and the inadequate class maturity of their individual elements create fertile ground for ideological diversions within the worker movement and for the dissemination of bourgeois ideology within it. In our time the ideological struggle within the international trade union movement is a component part of the general struggle of ideas which has developed with particular force between socialism and capitalism.

What are the key issues that this struggle revolves around in trade unions today?

Above all it is the question /of the goals of the struggle/ of working people. The laws of the formation and development of the trade union movement have been deeply revealed by Marxism-Leninism. Actions in support of achieving at least a bearable life, then the recognition of the need not for specific improvements but for counteraction to the entire system of the domination of capital, oppression, and exploitation, for a shift to revolutionary struggle, for the accomplishment of a social revolution, and finally for the formation of professional associations of working people as the creators of a new society -- such was the objective nature of the trade unions' progressive movement from economic struggle to actions in support of the revolutionary transformation of society. The trade unions of socialist states have traveled this road and now other detachments of trade unions are on this road.

The idea of the peaceful coexistence of labor and capital is preached by the apologists of reformism. As is well known, this trend, which arose in Britain, also had substantial influence on the trade union movement in other capitalist countries. Supported by the "workers aristocracy," its ideologists campaigned for a purely economic struggle. Their slogan was "No Politics in the Trade Unions." In our day reformism has been transformed into the concept of "social partnership."

The answer to the question of what employers gain from such "partnership" is given by the Austrian political scientist Emmerich Tolos. To the employers, he writes, such cooperation means a recognition of their right to ownership and a guarantee of its inviolability. Then, because of the trade unions' orientation toward reforms, it means a guarantee of "social peace" and leads to reduced pressure from working people on the government and political parties. Tolos goes on to note that "social partnership" has no influence on the redistribution of income in favor of population groups with a low standard of living. For precisely this reason, the author stresses, those who accept the existing social system -- conservative and moderately reformist forces -- are in favor of "social partnership," while those who reject the existing system also reject "social partnership."

When for a short period after the war capitalism developed in a relatively favorable situation, new social demagogic concepts arose on the wave of the economic boom: the concepts of the "great society," "new frontiers," and the "war against poverty" in the United States and the concept of the "general welfare state" in the capitalist countries of Western Europe. They were instilled in the consciousness of certain strata of working people to certain effect. In the 1970's and 1980's, when the critical nature of conflicts in the world capitalist economy intensified so sharply that they began to take the form of more frequent and destructive cyclical crises and the interweaving of these crises with the profound and prolonged structural crisis, the adherents of the concept of "social partnership" reacted to this by introducing new elements into the concept. Main emphasis is given to an appeal to share the difficulties of capital, to help it extricate itself from the maelstroms of crisis which arise first in one place and then another, and to become reconciled uncomplainingly to mass unemployment and to reduction of social programs.

In order to justify the increased economic pressure on working people, the idea was launched of the so-called social hammocks where the unemployed and other needy people supposedly pass their time, abusing society's social assistance. Capital and all who live off it understand well how dangerous the trade union movement's orientation toward developing the class struggle is to them. The constant attacks by capital on the militant detachments of trade unions and its aspiration to compromise trade union leaders in any way possible come from this.

One of the most recent examples of this is the strike by British miners. In the course of this strike over 9,000 coal miners were arrested. Many were wounded while standing on or near picket lines. The government tried more than once to apply various kinds of judicial sanctions to suppress the strike,

even seizing the financial means of the miners' trade union. But the offensive of the enterprise owners against the trade unions in Western countries is encountering increasing opposition. Working people do not want to reconcile themselves to a "social partnership" where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

One of the central problems of the ideological struggle is the problem of /"trade unions and the party"/.

V.I. Lenin convincingly showed that only by acting in conjunction with communist and revolutionary workers parties can trade unions be victorious in the struggle against capital. Defending the necessity of the trade unions' unity with such parties, V.I. Lenin delivered a crushing rebuff to the theory of the "neutrality" of trade unions, which bourgeoisie agents preached while striving to cut them off from the basic tasks of the struggle against capital and for the social liberation of working people. In connection with the polemic on the means of improving the economic situation of working people, he stated: "The theory of the neutrality of trade unions, unlike the theory of the need for their close connection with revolutionary social-democracy, inevitably leads to preference being shown to those means of improving this economic situation that blunt the proletariat's class struggle."² V.I. Lenin later returned to the problem of the interrelationship of the communist party and trade unions after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the shift to building a new society. Stressing the community of their goals in constructive work, he wrote in the thesis "On the Tasks of Trade Unions": "There can be no talk of any 'neutrality' of the trade unions. Any propaganda of neutrality is either a hypocritical cover for counterrevolutionary attitudes or a manifestation of total lack of consciousness."³

The theory of the "neutrality" and "independence" of trade unions is constantly present in the ideological arsenal of our opponents. Let us recall how they praised in every way the "independence" of the ringleaders of the Polish "Solidarity," inciting them to antistate acts and to the restoration of capitalism in Poland. The question of the interrelationship between the trade unions and the communist and workers parties is a question of correctly defining the goals and tasks of the struggle against capitalism, overcoming the ideology of reformism, and forming class consciousness among the broad masses of working people.

The driving force of the international trade union movement was and continues to be /proletarian internationalism and worker solidarity/. They are a reflection of the community of interests, tasks, and goals of the international working class and represent an objective law. It is no accident that capital and its servants constantly follow a divisive policy in the trade union movement and strive to isolate the trade unions of the socialist countries. In this connection those who would cause splits hide behind allegations that the trade unions of the socialist and capitalist countries face their own specific tasks and that for this reason there can be no serious basis for cooperation between them. From this, too, arises another attempt to drive a wedge between working people and to emasculate the concept of proletarian solidarity. Of course, one cannot fail to take into account the

distinctive features of the activity of trade unions working in countries with different socioeconomic systems. However, this does not negate the class community of goals of working people's trade unions wherever they operate. The community of goals of all working people was and continues to be the basis for displaying proletarian solidarity with trade unions of all orientations and all trends under the slogans of the struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress.

In recent years the ideological struggle around the problems of /democracy and human rights/ has markedly intensified. Slanderously accusing socialism of violations supposedly related to the so-called third basket of the Final Act of the All-European Conference in Helsinki, that is, the section of this document which deals with human rights, bourgeois propaganda uses this as a cover for the course of the aggressive circles of imperialism to undermine detente and depart from the accords reached on the development of international cooperation. The leaders of certain trade union centers of capitalist countries act in exactly the same way. They frequently appeal to us regarding the persecution of supposed trade union activists, show concern for the fate of certain degenerates, anti-Soviets, and turncoats, and link the development of cooperation to their pretensions to the role of overseer and monitor of the observance of human liberties and rights all over the world. Assertions of the suppression of trade union democracy in the socialist countries and of the socialist trade unions' lack of real rights are also familiar.

However, the field of human rights is the sphere in which the superiority of socialism is particularly obvious. And what is involved here is the real socioeconomic rights of Soviet people, the rights to work, to choose an occupation, to education, and to a broad range of social guarantees.

The position and role of Soviet trade unions in society are defined by the USSR Constitution. They are given major rights in managing state and social affairs and in solving political, economic, and social-cultural questions. And this is constantly confirmed by our foreign guests after they become acquainted with the actual situation of Soviet trade unions. For example, after he visited our country with a train of workers from the FRG, the social-democrat Rolf Werner, secretary of the German trade union federation of the state of Hessen, stated at a press conference : "After the trip to the USSR, my ideas about the activity of Soviet trade unions have changed considerably. It suffices to speak of their monitoring functions in production. As a trade union worker I must declare that I can only dream of the rights and opportunities which Soviet trade unions possess." The justness of these words is especially apparent now, when a true war has been declared against the trade unions in the countries of the West, above all in the United States. Here is what the newspaper LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE writes in this connection. "American employers have simply not become reconciled to the existence of trade unions. In the 19th century they hired cutthroats and private detectives to get rid of activists and suppress the strike movement. Provocations and individual and mass murders became commonplace. Today the destroyers of trade unions no longer carry cudgels and rifles but wear three-piece suits so on the outside they are little different from their masters. They have diplomas from the best universities. They operate quite openly.

They are called 'consultants.' They give their clients legal advice on how to prevent the creation of a trade union at their enterprise or how to liquidate an already existing trade union. More than 1,000 firms are directly or indirectly engaged in such activity. This is one of the most rapidly growing branches of the 'service sphere'; its turnover amounts to 1.5 billion dollars."⁴

The output of the American "consultants" on trade unions speaks for itself in the titles of "manuals" for employers, for example, "How to Make Trade Unions Unnecessary," and "The Process of Liquidating Trade Unions." The monopolies and the bourgeois state are conducting a joint offensive against the trade union. The breakup of the air traffic controllers' trade union in the United States received scandalous publicity. On the personal instructions of the President, all of the union's members were thrown into the streets with no right of appeal and with no right to work, to benefits, or to medical insurance. The trade union itself was dissolved. In September 1982, again on Reagan's demand, Congress declared the nationwide strike by railroad locomotive engineers to be illegal. In January of the following year repression fell upon the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, which was striving to conclude a fair collective contract. All of these operations against trade unions were accompanied by arrests, fines, and other punitive measures.

A very similar picture of an offensive against the trade unions is observed in Great Britain. Its reactionary essence may be judged, in particular, by the so-called state laws on employment, developed by the Thatcher government and adopted in 1981 and 1982. Almost any strike can be classified as an illegal strike by judicial bodies. The ban on solidarity strikes is particularly dangerous for the working class of Great Britain. British employers also acquired the right to selective dismissal of "undesirable" workers and to hire new ones, that is, strikebreakers, during strikes. As we can see, the assertions concerning trade unions' lack of rights in the socialist countries in fact apply to the other side, to the trade unions in the capitalist countries in the West.

A particularly acute ideological struggle is being carried on today concerning the problems of /war and peace/. Within the trade union movement in the West in recent years there has been a marked change in its recognition of its responsibility for the destiny of the world. Only a few years ago the leading trade union organizations in the countries of the West did not even want to hear of including questions of the struggle for peace and against the danger of war in their programs. "That is the business of governments," they declared. Now the position has changed. The program documents of the Association of German Trade Unions (DGB), the British Trades Union Congress (TUC), the trade union centers of Scandinavia and other countries, and of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) for the protection of common security are familiar.

However, the question arises of why the international trade union movement is still uncoordinated, and why are the difficulties in organizing joint antiwar actions so great? Why, for example, do the ICFTU and the World Labor Confederation reject the initiatives of the trade unions of the socialist

countries on cooperation in the antiwar movement? One of the main reasons for their position is the schemes of the servants of imperialism and the aspiration of the ruling circles in the imperialist countries to draw the workers movement of the West into the psychological war against the countries of socialism and to engender a "cold war" spirit in their ranks. This primarily concerns interpretations of the reasons for the arms race and for the danger of war, and the introduction into the consciousness of the masses of working people of the myth of the "Soviet military threat" or of the no less insidious false premise of the two superpowers' equal responsibility. But after all, it is well known that it was not the USSR which was the first to create and use nuclear weapons against many tens of thousands of peaceful citizens. It was not the USSR which was the initiator of the creation of the hydrogen bomb, of nuclear submarines, of multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles, or of the neutron bomb. It is not the USSR which is preparing to make not only land, sea, and air but also outer space into a battlefield.

Even the preparations for the 40th anniversary of the victory over Hitler's fascism and Japanese militarism have become a matter to capitalize on and a pretext for inflaming anticomunism and anti-Sovietism. Through distortion of historical truth, the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the rout of fascism and to the liberation of the peoples of Europe is passed over in silence. A noisy anti-Soviet commotion has developed around the Yalta Accords. According to the scenario of the Washington administration, which has prepared special instructions on a new approach to the Crimean conference, the decisions of the conference are being undermined with the aim of tailoring the map to the benefit of the West and to the satisfaction of revanchist forces. All of these ideological diversions pursue one aim, to discredit the Soviet peace-loving foreign policy and to shield those who are truly to blame for the arms race and tension in the world, that is, American imperialism and its allies.

Nonetheless, there are forces in the international trade union movement which support the idea of developing antiwar cooperation and which are moving toward such cooperation. Convincing confirmation of the growing antiwar sentiments within the trade union movement and of the trends toward unity of action was provided by the international trade union conference held in Moscow in May of this year and called "The 40th Anniversary of Victory Over Hitler's Fascism and the Trade Unions: Historical Experience, Contemporary Problems, and the View to the Future"; representatives of the trade unions of 117 countries participated. At the conference a thorough discussion was conducted on the most important matters concerning working people of all countries today, that is, the preservation of peace on earth and protection of civilization from the threat of nuclear war. Turning to the lessons of World War II, the participants in the conference stressed that these lessons teach peoples vigilance. In the course of the conference, a great deal was said at the plenary sessions and in the sections about the position and role of the trade union movement in the cause of protecting the working person's main right, that is, the right to live.

The 26th Workers' Conference of Countries of the Baltic Sea, Norway, and Iceland, held in Denmark at the end of May of this year, had the same marked

antiwar orientation. Its representatives sent a letter to the participants in the Geneva negotiations, the delegations of the USSR and the United States, in which they condemned America's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative and appealed to them to achieve positive results in the cause of halting the arms race. The Workers' Conference adopted an Address to the Working People and Trade Union Members of the Countries of the Baltic Sea, Norway, and Iceland. It proposes that a regional trade union meeting be held on questions of creating nuclear-free zones. An initiative was advanced to convene a conference of the leading representatives of the European national trade unions to discuss problems connected with the development of broad trade union cooperation in the antiwar struggle.

The ideological struggle in the international trade union movement is not weakening, but is becoming increasingly acute and intense. The subversive policies of our opponents are being developed primarily in the headquarters, so-called, of the ICFTU and the World Labor Confederation, which oppose the class wing of the trade union movement and its unifying organization, the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). The most recent example was the attempt to divert the trade unions of African countries from the anti-imperialist path. At the 4th congress of the Organization for African Trade Union Unity (OATUU), the ICFTU along with the AFL-CIO [American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations] was able to provoke a serious conflict which posed an acute crisis for this organization. Without having elected its leading organs, the congress broke off its work for a year.

The ICFTU and the World Confederation of Labor more and more often substitute direct ideological diversions for the struggle of ideas within the trade union movement, and they attempt to conduct many of these diversions under the aegis of the International Labor Organization (ILO). Let us at least recall the ICFTU's complaint concerning the USSR's supposed use of convict labor in the construction of the Siberian-Western European gas pipeline. The ILO accepted this complaint on trust and set it in motion. In order to unmask the slanderers, a great deal of work was done both by the government and by the trade unions. The AUCCTU invited delegations of workers from the enterprises in Italy, France, and the FRG where the equipment was being manufactured for the pipeline to visit the USSR. They spent some time on the line and met with construction workers. Their testimony played its part in unmasking the false accusations. In the press bulletin of the Permanent Representation of the USSR in Geneva, the Soviet side published its entire correspondence with the ILO on the subject of the ICFTU's complaint. The Soviet representatives held a special press conference in connection with the improper actions of the ICFTU and the ILO secretariat in Geneva. In the end, the ICFTU's complaint was nullified, or to put it more simply, its manufacturers were fully exposed as liars.

We are continually encountering similar kinds of provocations in the ILO. The ILO leadership was recently presented with the Declaration of the Socialist Countries on the Situation in the ILO. This declaration calls attention to many facts which attest to how this specialized UN institution evades fulfilling its main mission, serving the vitally important interests of working people. The document points out that the ILO leadership intentionally blocks any activity involving the problems of peace and international

security, while the resolutions on the economic and social aspects of disarmament adopted by the ILO General Conference in 1981 are not being implemented.

It was noted that reactionary forces are using this organization for ideological diversions against the socialist countries under the pretext of monitoring the application of ILO conventions. Its hostile position toward Poland, which forced the Polish People's Republic to leave the ILO, was a clear manifestation of these tendencies. The socialist countries that were the co-authors of the declaration stated that the ILO can and must sharply increase its contribution to the struggle for peace and disarmament and seriously concern itself with the socioeconomic consequences of the arms race and disarmament. It was stated that otherwise the ILO would isolate itself from the broad masses of working people.

Our opponents devote the most serious attention to ideologically influencing trade union workers and activists. For this purpose primary use is made of various forms of training trade union cadres at the expense of both trade union resources and the resources of various subversive funds. For example, the ICTFU cooperates closely in the training of cadres with the West German F. Ebert Fund, whose aim has been formulated as "establishing social partnership." The AFL-CIO spend enormous amounts of resources on training cadres with a reformist orientation. Its ideological tentacles have spread over every continent. They are the American Institute for the Development of the Free Trade Union Movement, with branches in 17 countries of Latin America and the Caribbean Basin, the Asian-American Institute of Free Trade Unions, with branches in 8 of the region's countries, the Afro-American Trade Union Center, with branches in 43 countries in Africa, and finally the Institute of the Free Trade Union Movement, whose task is to put ideological pressure on the trade unions of Western Europe. It is worth stating as an example that around 500,000 people who later took part in the creation or reorganization of 500 trade union organizations in their own countries have passed through the American Institute for the Development of the Free Trade Union Movement alone, since it came into being in 1962.

Anticommunism and anti-Sovietism in the trade union movement receive the full support of imperialist circles, above all the United States. In 1983 the Washington administration announced the so-called program of "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" which was later reinforced by the creation of a "National Fund for the Support of Democracy." In his speech at its inaugural ceremony, R. Reagan characterized the main task of the program in the following way: "Since our people are the descendants of the Yankee traders who were well able to sell their goods, we too must 'sell' our principles of democracy." It is hardly possible to say it more openly and cynically. It is characteristic that the bulk of the capital from the new fund is intended for the AFL-CIO, since this association has "accumulated a great deal of experience carrying out programs abroad." Subversive programs in the international trade union movement, let us add.

As one of the most important tasks, the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum singled out the task of persistently and convincingly making the masses aware of the truth about our foreign policy, winning public opinion over to

its side, actively and skillfully revealing the advantages of socialism, overcoming the barrier of antisocialist convictions, and delivering a firm rebuff to our ideological opponents. Questions of the ideological struggle in the international arena were thoroughly elaborated at the All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference on "Perfecting Developed Socialism and the Party's Ideological Work in Light of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum," held in December 1984; its significance was stressed at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The Soviet trade unions have always considered it their international duty to struggle to give the international trade union movement a class character, make it a movement fully reflecting the interests of the broad masses of working people. Our trade unions have joined the trade union movement and actively participate in its life every day. The resolution of the 1st All-Russian Congress of Our Worker Organizations, held in January 1918, already stressed that the Russian trade union movement could not fulfill its great tasks without entering into the closest ties with the international trade union movement.

In October 1919 in its address "To All Workers of Europe and America," the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions once more confirmed that our trade unions considered the struggle for the development and consolidation of workers and proletarian solidarity to be their main task in the international arena. The 1st International Congress of Revolutionary Trade and Production Unions, which met in Moscow in July 1921, was the result of the general process of consolidating the trade union movement. The congress set up the Red International of Trade Unions (Profintern), which was active till the end of 1937 and played an important role in the development of the international trade union movement.

In his greeting to the congress, V.I. Lenin wrote: "It is difficult to find words to express the full significance of the International Congress of Trade Unions. The process of winning trade union members over with the ideas of communism is advancing irrepressibly everywhere, in all countries and all over the world. It is advancing erratically, irregularly, unevenly, by overcoming thousands of obstacles, but it is advancing irrepressibly. The International Conference of Trade Unions will accelerate this advance."⁵

History has confirmed the words of V.I. Lenin. There have been and indeed are now a considerable number of difficulties on the road of the international trade union movement. But as a whole, the most major changes have occurred in the trade union movement in the years that have passed since the October Revolution. This above all refers to the increased class consciousness of working people and the development of the internationalist traditions of the working class. This is particularly important in our day, when imperialism has unleashed a "crusade" against socialism and the national liberation movements and intensified its ideological diversions.

Soviet trade unions today cooperate with the trade unions of 145 countries and with almost all detachments, of various orientations and allegiances, of the international trade union movement. The scope of our contacts can be judged by these figures. In 1984 over 1,200 trade union delegations from

126 countries visited our country; 750 of them represented trade unions in capitalist and developing countries. More than 700 Soviet delegations went to 86 countries and 400 of these visited capitalist and developing countries.

We are carrying out a considerable number of large-scale measures which are receiving a growing response in the trade union movement. Thus, last year a train of workers from the FRG (300 people), a Finnish delegation to participate in a meeting dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the conclusion of the armistice between the USSR and Finland (450 people), and groups of trade union activists from Austria and Japan (100 and 270 people) were received. A ship of peace and friendship (100 people) was sent to France and a friendship train (265 people) was sent to Finland.

This year the international work of Soviet trade unions is being organized under the banner of the 40th anniversary of victory over Hitler's fascism. A conference dedicated to the 40th anniversary of victory over Hitler's fascism was held in the USSR in early March; representatives from the trade unions of 18 European countries participated. A large-scale Soviet-Finnish meeting and the reception of a large group of trade union activists from Greece were dedicated to the same theme. Representatives of Soviet trade unions participated in the "Peace Cruise" events of Japanese working people, held in Nakhodka and Khabarovsk in April. Our guests this year are a friendship train from Austria (100 foreign participants) and a train of friendship and peace from France (250 foreign participants). We are carrying out a number of other large-scale measures.

Of course, the international trade union movement is developing in complex conditions.

Soviet trade unions, like the trade unions of other socialist states, continue to encounter the openly anti-Soviet line of the leadership of a number of trade union organizations, above all the American AFL-CIO trade union association. However, it must be noted that our contacts with branch trade unions in the United States, including the largest associations, are developing and getting stronger, though not as actively as we would like.

It is important to stress that attempts by reactionary forces to draw the trade union movement in the West as a whole into a new "cold war" with us have failed. The trade union organizations of the FRG and Great Britain and the trade unions of the countries of northern Europe are moving toward dialogue and the development of contacts. Suffice it to say that in the USSR this year summit talks with the leaders of the Association of German Trade Unions are to be held as a continuation of last year's talks in the FRG. There are to be meetings with the leaders of the central trade union associations of Denmark and of the General Labor Federation of Belgium. We are proposing to our Western partners that we shift from dialogue to really broad-scale cooperation.

The trade union movement of the liberated countries is a great force and is gaining strength. Our ideological opponents have not been able to turn this movement to the path of anticomunism and anti-Sovietism. We are building relations with the majority of working people's trade unions of these

countries on a class, anti-imperialist basis. The principled line of Soviet trade unions has been and continues to be cooperation with class trade union organizations and work within the WFTU, which expresses the views of the progressive forces of the trade union movement and is their unifying organization.

It is relevant to say that in October of this year the WFTU will celebrate the 40th anniversary of its formation. As is well known, in the course of the rout of Hitler's fascism the preconditions were formed to unite various trade union detachments on a class basis in a broad unitary organization. The London (February 1945) World Trade Union Conference paved the way for the formation of the WFTU and the 1st World Trade Union Congress in Paris approved it. The date 3 October 1945 -- when the congress, assembling delegates from 56 countries representing 66 million working people, adopted the WFTU Statute -- became the birthday of the WFTU.

The birth of the WFTU was a great victory for the international working class. It reflected the aspiration of working people for cohesion and unity and their resolution to actively struggle for their rights and interests and to achieve lasting peace on earth. The history of the WFTU is the history of the trade unions' struggle against the forces of militarism and reaction and the history of the working people's struggle for unity in achieving their social goals.

This fall in Moscow Soviet working people and trade unions will receive the participants in the 37th jubilee session of the WFTU General Council.

The international trade union movement, which numbers over 400 million people in its ranks, today represents a force capable of influencing the course of social development to an increasing extent. It is no accident that capital and all who serve it are striving to split and disunite the trade union movement and to impregnate it with bourgeois ideology.

But history has its laws. In the final analysis, the trade union movement is progressing along the road of social transformation of society and establishment of the ideas of justice, freedom, and equality and the ideals of peace.

FOOTNOTES

1. F. Tolos, "Sozialpartnerschaft und Neokorporatismusthateoen" in OSTERREICHISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT FUR POLITIKWISSENSCHAFT, No 3, 1982, pp 263-285.
2. V.I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Selected Works], Vol 16, p 435.
3. Ibid., Vol 37, p 404.
4. LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE, No 3, 1982.
5. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 44, p 72.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

MORE FLEXIBLE APPROACH TO ECONOMICS IN LAOS VIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 62-73

[Article by Valentina Adamovna Dolnikova, candidate of historical sciences and docent at the Institute of the Countries of Asia and Africa at Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov, and Salima Ishmuradovna Ioanesyan, candidate of economic sciences and senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies, under the rubric "In the Countries of Socialism": "Some Questions of Building Socialism in Laos"]

[Text] The many years of heroic struggle of the Lao people for national liberation and social progress under the leadership of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party (LPRP) led in the mid-1970's to the victory of the national-democratic revolution in Laos and to the formation in December 1975 of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR). The revolution in Laos entered the stage of shaping the foundations of the socialist order, bypassing the capitalist stage.

Relying on the general theoretical laws of socialist revolution, studying the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, utilizing the experience of the world revolutionary movement and the building of socialism in the USSR and other countries of the socialist community, and creatively applying them to the specific conditions of their own country, the LPRP formulated a strategy of socialist construction which is being changed and perfected as particular socioeconomic and political transformations are carried out.

Even before the victory of the revolution, at the 2nd party congress in 1972, the political program was worked out; it set the basic task -- "to prepare all necessary conditions for a direct transition to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development."¹ Fundamental changes have taken place in the country during the years of the republic: the monarchic system and feudal order were eliminated; the organs of popular-democratic authority are functioning successfully; and an extensive program of socioeconomic transformations which set up firm foundations for building a new, socialist society was developed and implemented. In the report to the 3rd LPRP Congress in April 1982, K. Phomvihan noted, "The building of socialism is the basic and decisive task. Only the building socialism creates conditions for bringing about the whole revolution, meets the expectations of all the country's peoples, and creates a firm foundation for defending the new order."²

The general line in the socialist reorganization of Laos was determined back in the first party-state documents of the LPDR. A large number of factors determined the Lao Republic's entry into the world socialist community. The guiding force of Lao society is the Marxist-Leninist People's Revolutionary Party of Laos. In the period of the conversion to socialism the party and state leadership of the LPDR focused all its practical activities on strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and the alliance of the working class with the peasantry in the country. The gradual development of public property, the establishment of socialist production relations, and the elimination of the exploitation of the working masses are also of fundamental importance. The LPDR's various ties with all socialist countries are being expanded everywhere.

By the time the LPDR was formed, the People's Revolutionary Party already had almost 30 years of experience carrying out socioeconomic reconstruction of society in the liberated regions of Laos and later on the scope of the entire country during the existence of the coalition organs of power in 1973-1975. Tasks of an anti-imperialist, antifeudal, and general democratic nature were being performed on the territory which the patriotic forces controlled. People's power functioned there, the foundations of national property and the state sector in the economy were being laid, collective forms of economic activity were being introduced, and the prerequisites for developing socialist social relations were thereby being created. The country's complete liberation and the declaration of a people's democratic system in Laos in 1975 posed a most complicated task for the young state -- to continue implementing this program but now in new conditions, with the existence of completely different economic trends and features of the economy which had taken shape during the preceding period in the liberated regions and in the former Vientane zone.³

Formulating particular paths of socialist development required that the party and state leadership of the LPDR study and give a deep scientific analysis to the existing socioeconomic and political situation in the country. It was distinguished by an extremely low level of development of the national economy, the socioeconomic and cultural backwardness of the population, and disruptions of normal economic life caused by the civil war and economic ruin, as well as political difficulties related to the intrigues of the imperialist powers and internal reaction. In this complex situation the LPRP and the LPDR government considered it necessary above all to try to solve the problems of strengthening the people's democratic system and the defense capability of the state, restoring the economy destroyed by the war, preventing starvation among the population, and providing it with the needed foodstuffs and industrial goods.

In 1976-1979 the LPRP and the LPDR government devoted main attention to performing the tasks formulated in the resolutions of the plenums of the LPRP Central Committee and the decisions of the Supreme People's Council and the LPDR Council of Ministers. These tasks were defined in the following way: forming and consolidating the organs of people's power; consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of an alliance of the working class with the peasantry and the achievement of cohesion, unity, and

cooperation among the broad strata of the population; organizing resistance to the ideological and cultural influence of forces hostile to the revolution; and propagandizing ideas of patriotism and internationalism. And after the first, basically political, stage of the people's democratic revolution was complete, the Lao people focused main efforts on the economic sphere in order to resolve the most important national economic problems.⁴

The republic began to implement a broad program of socioeconomic transformations and, as the immediate problem, the party tried to solve the problem of general development of the agricultural sector of the economy in order to provide Laos with food as quickly as possible and to gradually increase the country's export potential.

The first measures of the people's power were focused on forming the state sector of the economy. Soon after the republic was proclaimed, timber and mineral resources, the energy system, some of the industrial, transport, municipal, and trade enterprises, land in cities, the banking system, information and communications, the press, radio broadcasting, and printing were nationalized; the state monopoly of domestic trade was introduced; and control over the currency activities of individuals and companies was established. A monetary reform was also carried out and a uniform state budget established. At the same time the first enterprises of state and cooperative trade were set up. On the basis of the program developed by the party, collectivization in the Lao countryside was begun.

The broad popular support of the socioeconomic transformations being carried out in the country, the first successes in restoring and developing the national economy, and the revolutionary enthusiasm brought on by the historical victory of the Lao people, as well as the enormous amount of assistance to the Lao Republic on the part of the fraternal socialist countries helped accelerate certain economic reforms and permitted a more rapid rate of socialist construction than was possible in conditions of such a backward country as Laos.

In February 1977 a resolution of the LPRP Central Committee Plenum emphasized that the basic tasks of the people's democratic revolution had been accomplished in a shorter period of time than earlier assumed. In this connection, a great deal of emphasis was given to transformations of a socialist nature. The resolution gave special attention to the need to gradually shift from small to large-scale socialist production, convert agriculture and forestry to a base for developing industry and socialist industrialization, completely eliminate all types of exploitation, and improve the living conditions and material position of the working people.⁵ This marked the beginning of a new stage of economic construction in the LPDR. The party introduced a slogan on the simultaneous realization in the country of three revolutions: in production relations, in the field of science and technology, and in the field of ideology and culture.⁶

The fulfillment of the three-year plan of development of the national economy for 1978-1980 was an important stage of economic construction in Laos. In the difficult conditions of the transitional period the republic managed to achieve significant economic successes, especially as compared to the

prerevolutionary years. The average annual rate of increase in gross national product was accelerated from 3.3 to 9.8 percent, that is, it was almost tripled, while the corresponding indicators of the rate of increase in gross national product per capita rose from 0.9 to 7.2 percent, or eight-fold. The total value of gross national product in real market prices increased by 40 percent in those years.⁷ Production of all types of agricultural output expanded substantially. Thus, the rice harvest, Laos' main cultivated crop, rose from 724,000 to 1.054 million tons.⁸

During the years of the three-year plan, the prerequisites for socializing the means of production were steady accumulating. The LPRP and the Lao government took major steps to develop state and cooperative ownership everywhere, while preserving small-scale production and noncommodity systems and the restricted-functioning capitalist and broader state-capitalist sectors of the economy. The formation of the state sector made it possible to set up centralized planned management of the economy and to realize the plan's basic assignments. The state's role in the republic's national economy markedly increased. By 1980 in the country there were 188 state enterprises (of a total of 500) in industry and 30 -- in the agrarian sector. They were engaged in producing electricity, tin concentrate, lumber, gypsum, agricultural implements, bricks, hulled rice, and other commodities which were important to the national economy.⁹ All air transport and 60 percent of vehicular transport belonged to the state. In these years the cooperative economy also began to be developed intensively. In 1980 the state and cooperative sectors created 31.7 percent of all wholesale output. And they accounted for up to 93.1 percent of the value of gross national product in industry; 90 percent -- in construction; 32.5 percent -- in transport; 37.2 percent -- in trade; and 15.6 percent -- in agriculture.

By realizing its monopoly in domestic economic activity, in this period the Lao state laid firm foundations for the country's economic rapprochement with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and its participation in socialist economic integration. In close cooperation with the countries of socialism, using their comprehensive aid and relying on their economic and political support, the young republic worked on solving the complicated problems of transforming the economy and social relations. This process is the objective reality which the 26th CPSU Congress spoke of when it said that it is now impossible to imagine the assured development of one socialist country or another without ties with other fraternal countries.¹⁰

In this way, during the years of the first three-year plan, a definite base for the subsequent development of social production as well for the distribution, exchange, and use of commodities was set up in the LPDR.

At the same time, however, during the plan's fulfillment, a whole number of difficulties and economic disproportions were revealed, above all those related to the low initial level of the country's development and the underdeveloped nature of its socioeconomic structure and system of labor resources. In 1980 almost 85 percent of the Lao population lived in rural areas and more than 85 percent of the labor force was engaged in the agrarian sector of the economy. At that time four-fifths of the gross national product was produced in the agricultural economy together with secondary forest

industries.¹¹ As before, the Lao countryside basically relied on the small-scale commodity and even noncommodity peasant economies. The proportion of agricultural output taken to market remained extremely low. More than 80 percent of all the rice harvested in 1980 was used within the peasant households themselves, that is, less than one-fifth the rice harvest entered the market through state channels (compulsory deliveries and agricultural taxes) or through the hands of private merchants.

This situation posed the question to the Lao leaders of the need for a more realistic and scientific approach to performing the tasks facing the republic's economy. The improvement of the quantitative composition of national cadres working on questions of the economy, a result of the implementation of state measures to increase their qualifications and train specialists both within the country and abroad, also encouraged this approach.

The plenum of the LPRP Central Committee held in January 1979 was devoted to the problem of overcoming difficulties and performing the most vital tasks in the field of the economy and the further refinement of methods of carrying out socioeconomic policy. At that time K. Phomvihan noted, "The building of socialism is a very new problem for the party, the government, and the Lao people. There are as yet no examples in the world of solving the problems of building socialism in a small country with a small multinational population and a poorly developed economy. We encountered and are encountering numerous difficulties on the path to socialism."¹²

The main theoretical positions of the strategy of development worked out by the party at that time were reflected in the 7th Resolution of the LPRP adopted in November 1979 and in the party-state documents of 1980-1982. These positions were approved and confirmed by the historical decisions of the 3rd LPRP Congress, which met in April 1982. The party pointed out the need to overcome certain negative features of socioeconomic policy which were manifested in the accelerated pace of socialist transformations, the excessively rapid attack on the private sector, restrictions on the trade-commerce activities of private individuals and companies and the inadequate observance of the principle of material incentive by various social groups of the population, and above all the peasantry, and underestimation of the need for all-out development of commodity production and destruction of the noncommodity features of the economy. The application of bureaucratic, administrative-directive methods of managing the economy was noted as a serious shortcoming which often occurred.¹³

A more flexible socioeconomic policy which took better account of the actual level of development of Laos' economy, its multistructured nature, and the predominance of noncommodity and small-scale commodity economies in the social structure was worked out in those years. The party shifted from a policy of forcing socialist transformations to implementing gradual by-stage socioeconomic measures calculated for a long period of time whose final goal is a revolution in the field of production relations and the building of a socialist society in Laos. At the 3rd LPRP Congress, K. Phomvihan emphasized, "We have now entered the initial stage of a transitional period whose direction and task is on the whole to stabilize the situation in all fields, and in particular in three spheres -- guaranteeing political security,

consolidating the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and further improving the people's standard of living."¹⁴

The party worked out practical steps to improve management of the state and cooperative sectors of the national economy while simultaneously taking advantage of the economic potential of the remaining structures to gradually subordinate these structures to the state plan and create the conditions for building the economic foundations of a socialist society. Particular attention was paid to the need to strengthen the state financial-economic system and the various forms of state and cooperative trade, to organize a more flexible system of wholesale and retail prices, and to further expand foreign economic ties. In these same years a program of measures was worked out which was focused on increasing the profitability and profits of state enterprises, activating their cost-accounting activities, increasing the level of labor productivity, using material and labor resources efficiently, observing the principle of material incentive, and regularizing the labor payment of workers and employees. The course of the party and the government in the sphere of economics envisioned broader use of the law of value, commodity-monetary relations, and such economic levers as cost accounting, credit, prices, and profit.¹⁵ The particular economic program of the LPRP, which was developed in the decisions of the plenums after 1979, in many respects reflected the basic principles of the new economic policy (NEP) worked out by V.I. Lenin as applied to postrevolutionary Russia, refracted through the prism of Lao reality. In light of this, it should be taken into account that in Laos the building of socialism began in conditions where precapitalist and semicapitalist relations predominated its economy and noncommodity forms of production and exchange were preserved in the basic sector -- agriculture. Agriculture could not fail to have a negative effect on the progress of social transformations in the LPDR. In these conditions, all-out development of agricultural production and a higher level of labor productivity in Lao agriculture became the cornerstone of the new economic strategy elaborated by the party and focused on increasing the personal incentive of the peasants to raise agricultural yields. By making the problem of efficiently organizing distribution and exchange paramount, the party tried to subordinate them to resolving the crucial task of the transitional period, the development of production forces able to meet the goals of building the material-technical base of socialism. In practice it was precisely this which determined the party's socioeconomic policy after 1979, which was focused on using the various structures and forms of property extensively, activating trade-commerce activity, overcoming the noncommodity features of the economy, and expanding commodity exchange between the city and the countryside.

The LPRP and the LPDR government did an enormous amount of work to implement this program. Paramount attention was given to refining the system for managing the economy further and strengthening the state and cooperative sectors of the economy. The shift to long-term planning on the basis of the 1st five-year plan of development of the economy for 1981-1984 also helped increase the state's role in the society's economic and social life and develop new, socialist relations. The draft of the five-year plan developed by the National Planning Committee was ratified by the Supreme People's Council of the LPDR and acquired the force of law. The five-year plan became one of the important instruments of planned development of the country's

production forces and the "main tool of management of the economy and society."¹⁶

The gradual development and refinement of the state sector is a major factor of the consolidation of the socialist system and the expansion of the sphere of impact of the new, socialist social relations on all the structures which exist in the country and on the broad strata of Lao working people. In the early 1980's state economic organizations provided up to four-fifths of all the republic's domestic budget revenue.¹⁷ Moreover, resources which come to the budget from cooperative and private enterprises and farms and through foreign sources of financing -- aid received by Laos in the form of outright grants and preferential credits, primarily from socialist countries, as well as international organizations -- are redistributed through these state economic organizations.

Industry and trade play a decisive role in the development of the state sector; they account for almost 95 percent of the revenue of all enterprises belonging to the state. And industry accounts for approximately half this revenue while the rest is divided equally by domestic and foreign trade. The five-year plan assignments envision the further development of the state sector in industry. Approximately one-fifth of the resources directed to the material production sphere are to be used to improve the activity of already-existing facilities and to build new ones.

Important work is being carried out in the LPDR to improve the management of industrial production, increase the efficiency and profitability of the entire state sector, expand the cost-accounting activity of state enterprises, increase the amount of working capital at their disposal, and reduce the extent of their financing through the state budget.

The LPDR attaches political and economic importance to the practice of state capitalism on the path of socialist collectivization of all production and gradual transformation of private capitalist enterprises. V.I. Lenin believed that in the transitional period capitalism must not only be used but also directed into the channel of state capitalism as the direct link between small-scale production and socialism and a means, path, mode, and method of increasing production forces.¹⁸ In most cases the Lao state is building its relations with a comparatively few joint state-capitalist enterprises on a contract basis with the share participation by state capital, on the one hand, and private national capital on the other. In principle the state and the owner of a private business in joint enterprises share the profits in accordance with their share of the functioning capital.¹⁹ Private entrepreneurs also have rights, which are seldom restricted in time, to perform certain types of jobs and management functions as well as transactions dealing with buying raw materials and selling finished output. State economic organizations continually monitor the activities of joint enterprises and have a certain part of the industrial output they produce at their disposal, while part of the profits and revenue of the owners of these enterprises is deducted into the state budget in the form of various taxes and charges.

The development of the state-capitalist sector makes it possible to enlist additional capital in industry and to use production experience and the

organized business ties of private entrepreneurs to invigorate economic activity in the country and develop the national economy. In conditions where the political power in the LPDR is in the hands of the people while the state controls various forms of state capitalist activities, the consolidation and development of the state-capitalist sector plays a very positive role in gradually reorganizing the economy and social relations on a socialist basis and in overcoming petty bourgeois spontaneity.

The LPRP and the LPDR government consider domestic trade a major instrument to activate economic life, increase the marketability level of production, increase the amount of state revenue, increase the savings fund, develop state commodity turnover, and concentrate industrial and agricultural output in the hands of the state. Already in 1979-1982 the country's trade network, which till then had been limited to private trade enterprises, was substantially expanded through the creation of several hundred state and cooperative new stores, purchasing points, wholesale bases, and warehouses. The development of domestic trade stimulates the consolidation of economic ties between the capital and provincial centers, between the city and the countryside, and between various economic-geographic regions of the country, and, in this way, helps establish new social relations even in the most economically backward areas of Laos.

In these years purposeful measures were carried out to improve the conditions of commodity turnover in the country, with particular reference to free trade in agricultural products. The reduction of the size of the agricultural tax from 30 to 7 percent (in a number of regions -- to 14 percent) of the rice harvest depending on the fertility of the soil and irrigation conditions and the second grain harvest's tax exemption gave the peasants a certain incentive to increase the grain harvest and expanded their opportunities to sell the excess on the market or through state purchasing organizations.²⁰ At the same time purchase prices for rice, corn, peanuts, animal husbandry products, and other types of agricultural output were increased by 400-500 percent; this also increased the peasants' material incentive to sell to the state. All these measures helped increase the commodity fund of rice and other foodstuffs in the country. In recent years the republic has developed and is realizing a program to organize the countersale to rural laborers of foodstuffs and industrial commodities which they need. The introduction of a new, more flexible system of wholesale and retail prices for the output of state industrial enterprises helped expand domestic trade. In each case prices are changed according to the particular market situation on the scale of the entire country and in different provinces. The state began to practice the sale of foodstuffs and industrial commodities partly at set prices and partly at prices higher than that but 5-10 percent lower than market prices.²¹

As in industry, various forms of state cooperation with the private sector are being introduced into trade; this cooperation is carried out by setting up joint state-private trade enterprises and granting private merchants licenses to perform various commercial transactions. By promoting the activity of such enterprises, the state is able to utilize the individual initiative of private entrepreneurs, their familiarity with the market situation taking shape in the country, and their ability to adapt themselves to the rapidly changing needs of rural and artisan production. In Lao conditions where capitalist

relations in the sphere of exchange and distribution are at an exceptionally low level of development and are found primarily in the provinces of the Central Region, such a policy helps attract very large groups of small merchants to cooperation with the state and is an important factor of influencing the new system and socialist social relations in the private sector.

A number of state measures in these years have been directed to converting foreign trade into one of the operating levers to develop the country's production forces and improve the material base of production. Special government decrees established a monopoly on the export and import of goods which are most necessary to the national economy. The state uses the monopoly right to export all types of lumber and articles from wood, tin concentrate, and other types of mineral raw materials, precious metals, rice, coffee, medicinal herbs, gum benzoin, and cardamon (this list can be supplemented at the government's direction) and to import machines and equipment, spare parts, trucks, tractors, cement, rolled ferrous metal products, petroleum products, rice, and certain other commodities.

Rules have been introduced for concluding foreign trade deals and a system for granting licenses to private firms trading in commodities not covered by the state monopoly has been established in the republic. Special decrees legalized various forms of the LPDR's border trade with the neighboring countries of Indochina. And state control of all types of foreign trade transactions is being established while duties imposed on private exporters and importers have become a major source for replenishing state budget revenue.

The development of the state sector in the economy and the state's greater role in the society's economic and social life was accompanied by the creation of a more flexible and efficient system for managing the economy and by the improvement of methods of managing social production. Along with the reorganization of ministries, the state apparatus was reduced and the work force was redistributed to the benefit of the production sectors.

Government measures in the wage sphere were directed at observing the principle of material incentive for working people and payment to workers and employees contingent on the quantity and quality of their labor. A 1979 decree increased the earnings of people working in the state sector by an average of 170 percent. A more differentiated structure of wages was established which took the level of skills of the workers and their length of service at enterprises into consideration. Bonuses for workers engaged in industry, construction, or state farms were introduced and special funds for paying bonuses for the successful fulfillment and overfulfillment of plan assignments were envisioned.²² Subsequently, the government also increased the wage rate of workers and employees of the state sector more than once.

The people's power is devoting an exceptionally large amount of attention to training skilled personnel for state enterprises and institutions and to increasing the ideological-political, occupational, and cultural level of these workers. Advanced as a paramount task is the task of educating, retraining, and expanding the number of specialists of all levels and

sectors.²³ The particular need for this work in Laos stems from the circumstance that the state apparatus, including hired workers at state enterprises, is formed there to a substantial degree of persons who received their education and some experience in labor activity back under the old regime. In all more than 5,000 specialists with secondary and higher education were trained in the republic in the years of the three-year plan, while in the period of the five-year plan alone the number of specialists with higher qualifications must be increased by at least 4,000. Moreover, almost 70,000 young men and women will receive secondary special and vocational-technical education.

The policy of the party and state on developing and further refining the state sector in the economy definitely promotes the formation of Lao society's new social structure. It is precisely here that we find concentrated detachments of the working class working at the largest and most modern enterprises in industry and in agriculture and large groups of party and economic workers who play a decisive role in the country's socialist transformation. The new people's intelligentsia is growing. In this way, the most progressive, politically active, and professionally trained part of Lao society most involved in the sphere of new social relations is being formed.

Certain qualitative changes in the structure of the gainfully employed population also fit this process. In 1982, 120,000 workers and employees, that is, several times more than the total number of hired workers in all of prerevolutionary Laos, were employed in the state sector. They included 15,000 industrial workers, approximately the same number of workers in state trade enterprises and the service sphere, and 30,000-40,000 representatives of the people's intelligentsia and other categories of employees.²⁴ The overwhelming majority of people working in the state sector live in cities and make up more than half the urban gainfully employed population. All this attests to the steadily increasing social and political significance of these urban strata and the continually expanding sphere of operation of socialist relations developing within the framework of the state sector as a result of the process of direct involvement in it by broader masses of Lao working people -- from the city and from the countryside -- and of representatives of nonproletarian groups of the population -- small merchants, artisans, and others. This is a major result of the socioeconomic policies of the Lao people's state, aimed at the all-out development of the state sector of the economy, and a firm foundation for the subsequent implementation of the program of socialist transformations in a country which is building socialism in conditions of preserving precapitalist forms of production.

Marked changes have also occurred in the social structure of the rural population -- the bulk of the country's inhabitants. Collectivization is the main part of the agrarian policy of the LPRP and the LPDR government. "In the area of the socialist transformation of agriculture, the task is posed to mobilize the peasants to organize cooperatives," noted K. Phomvihan at the 3rd LPRP Congress.²⁵

The LPRP and the LPDR government have developed a policy in the area of unifying peasants into cooperatives; it envisions four forms of cooperative organization, and in line with this allows the possibility of converting one

form into another. Solidarity and labor exchange groups, which as a rule are created to perform particular types of jobs, cooperatives where labor, agricultural implements, and draft animals are combined, and cooperatives where the peasants' landholdings are subject to partial or complete collectivization have become the main types of unification into cooperatives in the LPDR. And, as was said above, the methods and degree of collectivization of labor efforts and means of production can be modified to conform to the changing actual economic situation.²⁶ The application of this system makes possible progressive development of cooperatives and insures economic stimuli for peasant farms which are combined in them. The cooperative commission of the LPRP Central Committee was set up in 1978 and the first congress of Lao cooperative members was held. By 1979 there were 2,800 cooperatives and 60,000 solidarity and labor exchange groups in the country.²⁷

However, the creation of cooperatives in Laos, as in other countries which were former colonies, encountered a whole number of difficulties related to general economic backwardness, the lack of a modern industrial sector in the economy, and the low marketability level of agriculture. Such historically shaped features of the agrarian system and land relations in the country as the great variability in tillable land, the popularity of slash and burn farming, the incomplete formation of private property rights to land, and the fragmentary nature of peasant landholdings, which sometimes consisted of several dozen rice fields (paddies) located in valleys and mountain slopes, also retard the development of the cooperative movement in Laos. Along with these objective factors, the organization of cooperatives and the start of their operation in a number of cases was associated with a certain haste on the part of local authorities, who at times tried to carry out the collectivization of the countryside at a more rapid rate than conditions allowed; frequently farms which did not have real economic incentives to increase production were combined.

The resolutions of the LPRP Central Committee plenums (1979-1980) and the decisions of its 3rd congress emphasized the need to carry out a more flexible and consistent policy in regard to developing the cooperative sector of the national economy.²⁸ The party pointed out that cooperatives must be set up on the basis of strict observance of the Leninist principles of unifying peasants into cooperatives (voluntary membership, personal material incentive, distribution of incomes by labor, conversion from simple forms of cooperation to more complex ones, and all-out state assistance for cooperatives to consolidate their economic independence and develop the countryside's production forces). The practice of enlisting farms which were not economically prepared for it into cooperatives as well as cases of bureaucratic management in relation to already existing associations were sharply criticized. In connection with this, some of the cooperatives which proved unprofitable were disbanded. But even so a continual process of creating new cooperatives went on in the country and more suitable forms of cooperation which were beneficial to the peasants were developed. During 1982 alone, 590 new cooperatives were set up in the country. By the beginning of 1984, there were more than 2,000 cooperatives and 50,000 solidarity and labor exchange groups in Laos. It is interesting that in the villages where cooperatives were disbanded, as a rule the peasants had not yet returned to

individual labor but had united into solidarity groups and in this way seemed to have adapted themselves to the forms of cooperation which were more suitable for them.²⁹ Model cooperative farms with collectivized land and livestock and state agroindustrial complexes which by their own example demonstrate the advantages of the cooperative sector of the economy to the peasants began to operate in many provinces. In cooperatives the peasants first began to shift to the practice of raising two rice crops a year, gradually overcoming the fragmented nature of land sections, and setting up unified cooperative fields.³⁰

The development of the cooperative movement is gradually increasing its influence on the social make-up of the Lao peasantry. Today 2,456 cooperatives which unite 41 percent of the peasant farms and have 47 percent of the tillable land³¹ have been set up in the country; more than half the rural population is involved in them. These figures attest to the significant changes in the social structure of the Lao countryside and the general accustomization of large strata of the rural population to collective forms of labor developing in the country and to socialist social relations. The cultural revolution which is being successfully realized in the country in many respects also promotes positive changes in the social status of the Lao peasantry; a result of this revolution is that the bulk of the work to eliminate mass illiteracy is complete -- at the present time 85 percent of the population knows how to read and write while illiteracy has been completely eliminated in 7 of the 13 provinces.³²

Along with the intensively developing cooperative movement and the significant progressive changes in the social structure of the rural population, individual peasant farms, which accounted for up to 80 percent of all tillable land in 1983,³³ continue to play a decisive role in the production of various types of agricultural output in Laos. Taking this into account, the LPRP and the LPDR government considered it necessary to take measures to support private peasant farms. They include the aforementioned decrees on conducting a more flexible tax policy in regard to the peasants, which insures a certain freedom for their economic activities, higher purchase prices for agricultural output, and the development of various forms of state and cooperative trade. The state encourages peasant farms to become involved in various types of artisan labor. As a result of this policy, the objective conditions for developing a small-scale trade structure, overcoming the noncommodity features of the economy, and using all the country's labor resources more rationally are gradually being created in the LPDR. All this conforms to the famous Leninist thesis on the need, in a certain stage, to live with small-scale producers, while remolding and reeducating them.³⁴

A private capitalist structure also operates in the republic. The state recognizes the advisability of utilizing its economic potential in the interests of developing the national economy in the transitional period to socialism, but in light of this it strives to limit its exploitative tendencies. Included in the population engaged in the private capitalist economy are the urban petty bourgeoisie, represented by owners of small and very small enterprises in industry, trade, and the service sphere, whose approximate number is estimated at 30,000 people, as well as the rural bourgeoisie, which is comparatively small in Laos.³⁵ In the present stage of

economic development, the social functions of these strata of the bourgeoisie lie mainly in the fact that, in conditions of the low marketability level of national production, they are the ones who most help increase the economic activism of the population today and help meet a certain part of its needs for necessary goods, and in this way help awaken the primary production forces of small and very small economic units in the city and the countryside of the republic. The overwhelming majority of the petty bourgeoisie in Laos recognizes and supports the policies of the new revolutionary power.³⁶

Groups of middle and large bourgeoisie in Laos are now relatively small. There are no more than 100 families engaged in capitalist enterprise in modern industry, trade, and construction in the country and several hundred entrepreneurs who can be considered part of the middle industrial and trade bourgeoisie. Preserving the commanding heights in the hands of the state while developing fairly flexible and varied forms of its cooperation with private and private capitalist sectors and continually refining the financial and tax levers for state monitoring of the activities of private individuals and companies, the state is able to use the monetary and material resources in the hands of these groups of the bourgeoisie and their economic experience and knowledge of the specific features of the local market in the interests of developing the national economy.

The socioeconomic policies of the leadership of the Lao Republic, aimed at all-out development of the state and cooperative sectors, the gradual transformation of small-scale trade production, and the utilization of the economic potential of the private capitalist structure which is preserved in the country, taking the interests of the working strata of the population into consideration above all, insure people's power the support of their overwhelming majority and create the foundation for further progressive advances in the social structure of the city and the countryside.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Phomvihan, "Revolyutsiya v Laose: nekotoryye osnovnyye uroki i glavnyye zadachi" [Revolution in Laos: Some Basic Lessons and Main Tasks], Moscow, 1980, p 174.
2. PRAVDA, 28 April 1982; "III syezd Narodno-revolyutsionnoy parti Laosa. Vyentyan, 27-30 aprelya 1982 g." [The 3rd Congress of the People's Revolutionary Party of Laos. Vientiane, 27-30 April 1982], Moscow, 1984, p 24.
3. For more details on these differences, see: S.I. Ioanesyan, "Laoskaya Narodno-Demokraticeskaya Respublika" [The Lao People's Democratic Republic], Moscow, 1979.
4. See: Phoumi Vongvichit, "30 Years of Struggle -- The Second Year of Freedom" in PMS, No 11, 1976, p 54.
5. K. Phomvihan, "Revolution in Laos," op. cit., p 182; "The Strategy of the Conversion to Socialism" in PMS, No 9, 1981, p 21.

6. K. Phomvihan, "Revolution in Laos," op. cit., pp 182, 190.
7. Quoted from: "Handbook of International Trade and Development. Statistical Supplement," New York, 1981, Table 6. 1; "R.D.P.L. Rapport sur la situation economique et social. Strategie de development et besoins d'assistance," Vientiane, 1983, p. Ch. 1-2.
8. "R.D.P.L. Rapport sur la situation economique," p. Ch 3-3, 4-A.
9. See: NOVOYE VREMYA, No 27, 1983; INFORMATION BULLETIN, Prague, 1984, Vol 22, No 3 (499), p 62.
10. "Materialy XXVI syezda KPSS" [Materials of the 26th CPSU Congress], Moscow, 1981, p 8.
11. Quoted from: HORIZONT, Berlin, No 28, 1982.
12. Kaysone Phomvihan, "Rapport sur l'etat de l'edification du regime democratique populaire Lao au cours des 3 années ecoulees et sur les orientations et taches de l'annee 1979," Vientiane, 1979, p 14.
13. R.D.P.L. BULLETIN QUOTIDIEN, Vientiane, 30 April 1982.
14. PRAVDA, 28 April 1982.
15. K. Phomvihan, "The Strategy...", op. cit., p 22.
16. PRAVDA, 28 June 1982.
17. Cited from: "Memoire de la Republique democratique populaire Lao," Paris, 1981, p 11; "Quarterly Economic Review of Indochina: Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Annual Supplement 1982," London, 1982, p 20.
18. See: V.I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Selected Works], Vol 43, p 229.
19. "The Far East and Australasia 1982-1983. A Survey and Directory of Asia and the Pacific," London, 1983, p 707.
20. The amount of rice considered necessary to satisfy the family's needs is completely exempt from taxes. In various regions of Laos it is determined differently.
21. R.D.P.L. BULLETIN QUOTIDIEN, 30 April 1982.
22. "Asia Yearbook 1981," Hong Kong, 1981, p 183.
23. PRAVDA, 28 April 1982.
24. KOMMUNIST, No 6, 1983, p 95.

25. PRAVDA, 28 April 1982.
26. PMS, No 1, 1983, p 76.
27. Ibid., p 77.
28. PRAVDA, 28 April 1982.
29. PRAVDA, 22 May 1984; SIENG PASASON, Vientiane, 1 January 1983; PMS, No 1, 1983.
30. PMS, No 1, 1983, pp 78-79.
31. K. Phomvihan, "30 Years of the Struggle for National Independence and Socialism" in KOMMUNIST, No 5, 1985, p 78.
32. KOMMUNIST, No 6, 1983, p 100; NIAN ZAN, Hanoi, 2 December 1982.
33. SIENG PASASON, 1 January 1983.
34. See: V.I. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 41, p 27.
35. NOVOSTI VYETNAMA, Hanoi, No 6, 1982, p 8.
36. Ibid.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremenny mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

EFFECTS OF MICROELECTRONIC REVOLUTION ON EMPLOYMENT DISCUSSED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 119-124

[Article by Valentina Sergeyevna Azhayeva, senior editor at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences: "Microelectronics and Employment: The Canadian Experience"]

[Text] In the second half of the 1970's in Canada, as in many other capitalist countries of the world, people began to talk about the "second industrial revolution" marking the end of the machine age and the start of the computer age. Canadian researchers express the opinion that the spread of modern computers with microcomponents is not simply something new in the life of Western society but a factor which is fundamentally changing it. Microelectronics differs from all preceding innovations in that it can be used in virtually all sectors of the economy and, according to the predictions of scientists, will bring about unprecedented socioeconomic changes both in labor activity and in the life of society as a whole in the not-too-distant future. Never before in history has so little time passed -- only 10 years -- between an invention and its universal introduction. Canadian scientists have calculated that the speed of the spread of new technology is 7-fold to 10-fold greater than the distribution of previous technology.¹

The difference between the old computer and the inexpensive general-purpose computer with microcomponents, writes the Canadian researcher H. Menzies, is the same as between steam power and electricity. In his opinion, the new computer will play the same role in spreading automation as electricity played in spreading mechanization.²

In the early 1980's a number of studies on the influence of microelectronics on employment appeared in Canada. And although these works note that in our day it is still difficult to determine the total effect of new technology's impact on employment, their authors can already be definitely divided into "pessimists" and "optimists" according to their evaluation of the results of this impact.

The "pessimists" believe that the broad introduction of microelectronic equipment will entail increased mass unemployment: by increasing labor productivity it will fail to help create new work positions. The "optimists" believe that such a categorical evaluation is wrong, since the consequences of

technological changes for employment are difficult to determine at present. The last 30 years have shown that when there is economic growth and demand increases, steady progress in the field of technology is compatible with increased employment.

The "optimists" acknowledge that unemployment may increase during the dissemination of new technology. But if new technology is not introduced, unemployment will increase even more since whole sectors of industry will fall into decay, becoming uncompetitive in comparison with their rivals from other countries. Above all this affects Canadian exports. The "optimists" note that in present conditions there is a temptation to slow down the growth of labor productivity or set technological innovations aside in order to thereby solve the employment problem. But this measure, in their opinion, will do more harm than good. The artificial protection of certain sectors of industry will lead to inevitable backwardness in the future.

The "optimists" propose considering unemployment a temporary evil which must be endured now in order to insure employment in the future. The introduction of new technology, assert the "optimists," will be accompanied by the appearance of new specializations and new work positions; above all microcomputers will replace man in those types of work which give him the least satisfaction. According to the evaluations of the Canadian Association of Progressive Technology, in the next 10 years 500,000 new work positions will be created in companies which manufacture and use new technology.³

In contrast to the "optimists," the "pessimists," citing historical experience, assert that technology has always only enslaved people rather than liberated them. Despite the appearance of many new specializations in various fields, prospects for creating new work positions are not encouraging. According to calculations of trade unions, microelectronic equipment could provide production with all types of goods and services using only 20 percent of the working people presently engaged in creating them.⁴

The negative consequences of introducing microcomputers, the "pessimists" believe, can be minimized primarily through developing a powerful domestic electronics industry on the basis of national research and development. In order to realize this plan, the Scientific Council of Canada proposed the following:

choose a number of crucial commodities which are used in Canada and organize their production within the country (equipment for the mining industry, agricultural machinery, and so forth);

stress the development of sectors which produce progressive equipment and technology which are not yet being developed in other countries (solar and wind power units, oceanographic equipment, long-distance communication equipment, and transport for high latitudes).

The "pessimists" attach a great deal of significance to improving the educational system. They calculated that from 1979 to the end of the century most specializations will change two-thirds of their content and use new

knowledge and different skills. "As literacy is the basic condition for life in the contemporary world," writes H. Menzies, "so knowledge of computer systems will be essential in the future."⁵ The technological race will turn education into a continuing process. The complication is that most people will be forced to adapt to changes at a mature age and this involves breaking psychological stereotypes and changes in the system of values.

The idea of mastering a traditional occupation and "computer literacy" simultaneously is finding increasing support. As new equipment "takes over" production and the office and workers and employees in turn begin to assimilate it, demand for pure specialists in computers will begin to decline. Foreseeing that in the near future microelectronics will become an ordinary phenomenon and an element of technical support in the production and technical spheres, Canadian universities are even now proposing new programs of instruction: a profession plus "computer literacy."

In the last decades a gradual increase in the labor-saving effect has occurred in Canadian industry. From 1961-1976 the production of manufacturing industry output more than doubled while employment increased by 28 percent. The production of mining industry output also more than doubled while the number of work positions increased by only 18 percent. In the automotive industry from 1957 through 1974, the number of workers increased by 25 percent while vehicle production more than tripled.⁶ These figures confirm that the expansion of the scale of production has occurred in the period under study mainly through the introduction of new equipment and technology and the intensification of labor.

Nonetheless, Canada is still behind its foreign competitors in the technological race. By the early 1980's, according to data of an OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] report, Canada was in 10th place among Western countries regarding the level of introduction of new technology.

The level and rate of development of Canada's manufacturing industry is lower than in the main capitalist countries. The proportion of investments is also lower than in other OECD countries. In the period 1960-1978, the Canadian manufacturing industry accounted for only 14 percent of all private investments (excluding housing construction), while this indicator averaged 17.6 percent in other OECD countries.⁷ Foreign monopolies control 60 percent of the manufacturing industry. Thus, for example, in the field of electronics they control 72 of the 100 leading Canadian firms. The weakness of the Canadian manufacturing industry does not permit it to produce microelectronic equipment. Consequently, in the late 1970's, 50 percent of the domestic market for consumer goods was supplied by imports. In the field of computers and office equipment this proportion reached up to 90 percent.

The predominance of foreign capital has a negative effect on the development of NIOKR [scientific research and experimental design work] in Canada. Despite the fact that the state spends substantial amounts of capital for research and development, the total share of expenditures for NIOKR is 1 percent. Gross national product is less than in any other industrially developed capitalist country.⁸ This is explained by the fact that, under

conditions of sharp competition and the shortage of capital, the transnational corporations which dominate the Canadian economy first introduce new equipment and technology at their own head enterprises (primarily in the United States) and only later in the branches. As a rule branches use ready-made technology, adapting it to their own conditions.

Thus, while in the United States NIOKR being conducted by firms has become a fundamental catalyst of industrial growth, "in Canada nothing similar has been accomplished."⁹ As a result, the influence of NIOKR on employment in the form of the creation of new work positions has been minimal in Canada. Total employment at enterprises of one of the largest high-technology sectors of the transnational IBM Corporation increased by 13 percent from 1978 through 1982 but declined by 5 percent in its branch in Canada.¹⁰

The first wave of the introduction of computers into industry occurred in the 1950's-1960's. As a result, metal smelting, cellulose processing, and paper production were automated. The new wave of the introduction of computers in the 1980's was directed primarily at automating production control.

The Canadian researcher W. Clement, who studied the impact of new technology on employment in the mining industry, used the largest mining company, INCO, as an example to show that the automation of surface and underground jobs in the period from 1972 through 1981 led to a 42 percent reduction in the number of workers employed.¹¹ Above all, higher labor productivity was "to blame" for this. In a mine using the old methods, 1,000 workers extract 5,000 tons of ore a day, and at an automated mine 185 workers extract 3,800 tons of ore a day. A simple calculation shows that in order to fulfill the daily norm using new equipment, only 238 workers -- slightly more than one-fourth the previous number -- are needed.

The breaking down, simplifying, and standardization of labor operations engendered a system of so-called modular instruction. The training process, which previously took miners years, is now compressed into a few weeks. Each piece of equipment has its own course. The advantages are the ability to replace a highly skilled miner with a machine operator and savings in instruction costs and wages. However, this system of training "ties" the worker to a particular type of equipment and particular companies and leads to segmentation of the labor market and worse conditions for sale of work force. In contrast to the generally accepted opinion that introducing new technology increases the need for skills in workers, the /total effect/ [printed in italics in text] of automation in combination with "modular instruction" was just the reverse, writes Clement.¹²

The effect of the tendencies described accounts for the changes in the structure of Canada's work force. Because scientific research and development is mainly conducted in the United States, the automation of production leads to an insignificant rise in the number of highly skilled personnel in microelectronics and robot building and a substantial increase in the number of technicians and machine operators. The use of industrial robots to assemble articles at the same time helps reduce the number of workers. At the present time the robot's "labor" costs companies 4 dollars an hour while the

labor of a worker costs 14 dollars. By 1990, according to scientists' estimates, these indicators will be 1 dollar and 30 dollars.

It is obvious that in industry as a whole the introduction of new technology leads to lower employment. Many specializations are disappearing altogether. In the future, instead of controlling machines and handling materials, plant workers will be increasingly engaged in monitoring the activity of and servicing automated systems. A broad circle of specializations in the manufacturing industry is gradually being replaced by a rather narrow number of occupations related to electronics. The same thing is happening in the mining industry.

So far the introduction of new technology in Canada has had the greatest impact on management and office work. In the 1970's the cost of office upkeep doubled and amounted to half of all the firms' costs. And labor productivity in offices rose by only 4 percent, as compared to 80 percent in the manufacturing industry. The average plant worker needed 25,000 dollars worth of equipment, while the office employee needed 2,000 dollars worth. When Canadian firms were surveyed it was revealed that on the average each office amassed up to 53 million sheets of paper. If all the information contained on them were transferred to a computer's memory, 250,000 dollars would be saved a year.¹³

In this way, there arose, on the one hand, an economic need to reorganize labor in offices and on the other, the technological base for a radical increase in the productivity of management and office work was created as a result of rapid technical progress in the microelectronics field and a substantial reduction in the cost of computer equipment and electronic devices.

A sharp reduction in the number of employees occurs during the technological reorganization outlined. From 1974 through 1980, for example, employment among office employees of traditional occupations -- typists, stenographers, and so forth -- declined by 4,500 units, while 2,000 new work positions related to computer work were created, that is, overall employment declined to less than half its previous level.

A similar situation is taking shape in the insurance field. From 1975 through 1980 the number of office employees in that field declined by 11 percent, while the number of skilled specialists and managers increased by 30 percent. Nonetheless, in an absolute sense, the number of skilled specialists and managers increased by 4,000 people, while the number of office employees declined by 6,000 people.

The number of people engaged in trade is to be cut in half in the 1980's. The intensity of the labor of those who continue to work will increase substantially. Even now computer-monitoring data on cashiers' labor productivity is hung up in stores for general viewing and those who do not meet the norm are switched to a shorter work day.

The automation of telephone service led to a sharp decline in the number of telephone operators in the 1970's. The decrease amounted to 40 percent in Toronto alone.

The polarization of office and management labor is taking place. On the one hand, a shortage of highly skilled work force arises and, on the other, unemployment among average-skilled employees rises rapidly. The main mass of women engaged in the service sphere have low skills, and employment declines at their expense above all. According to trade union predictions, if no measures are taken, 1 million women will be unemployed by 1990.

During the course of the 1960's-1970's, the Canadian government showed constant interest in the problems of new technology and its impact on employment. In the 1970's on the federal level and in three provinces where social-democratic governments were in power (Saskatchewan, British Columbia, and Manitoba), laws were passed concerning rules for introducing technological changes. The 1973 amendment to the Canadian Labor Code envisioned that managers must announce within 90 days changes which could affect the working conditions of a large number of those employed and must give information on the essence of the change, the time of its introduction, and the number of workers it will affect. The law grants trade unions the right to refuse to observe the conditions of a contract when employers have not announced the proposed changes and to demand that a new collective contract be concluded if the conditions of the old one do not take the technological changes which have occurred into account. If there is a paragraph in the collective contract which envisions a procedure for resolving questions related to technological changes, the law does not apply. It is important to note that members of trade unions enjoy no legislative protection. But for members of trade unions legislation does not precisely identify what constitutes technological change, which questions may be negotiated, and so forth.

In the 1980's interest in the problems of new technology has increased sharply. In 1982 alone, three government reports on microelectronics were published. The Ministry of Labor put out the report "Microcomponents -- Potential, People, and Partnership." Canada's Scientific Council put out "Planning the Information Society. Tomorrow Will Be Too Late" and the Government of Ontario -- "Microelectronics. A Government of Ontario Committee Report."

All the reports speak of the need to establish a powerful electronics industry in Canada as one of the major sectors of the economy for the country's continued development. They point out Canada's serious backwardness in the use of robots as well as Canadian companies' dependence on foreign firms, especially in the area of research and development. As a positive feature they note that 80 percent of the domestic market in computer software, unlike the production of computers themselves, belongs to Canadian companies. The reports emphasized that Canada has traditionally played an important role in developing communications systems, though to a greater degree in theoretical research than in applied spheres. This tradition should facilitate the introduction of microelectronics.

The reports assign a special place to analyzing the impact of new technology on the position of working people. Canada's Scientific Council estimated that from 1931 through 1971, the proportion of Canadian workers engaged in the "information sector" doubled. According to some evaluations, in 1985 the "information sector" in Canada will take sixth place among the sectors of the economy in number of people employed. However, the proposal was made that the positive impact of technological changes on employment will only be short-term and, when old and newly created sectors of the work force have been saturated, long-term trends leading to increased unemployment, mainly structural, will begin to operate.

The governmental reports are permeated with concern for the socioeconomic consequences of increased labor productivity. On the one hand, the new technology is the path to being "saved" from strikes, absenteeism, and low production efficiency and, on the other, it is a path toward loss of skills by working people, increased alienation in society, and a simultaneous increase in profits and decline in the income of the broad working masses, and consequently, a decline in effective demand and an increase in social tension. Therefore, the governmental reports attach a great deal of significance to workers' participating in the process of introducing new technology. Otherwise, the documents note, this process will become protracted and will be unable to rapidly increase the competitiveness of the Canadian economy.¹⁴

The significance of programs of instruction and reeducation are especially emphasized. The reports under examination point out Canada's backwardness in the area of retraining workers. In connection with this, the question is posed of the need to better adapt the educational system to contemporary needs; otherwise, universities and colleges will be unable to satisfy the country's needs for specialists in electronics and computers and technicians and technologists. If the required reforms are not carried out, a 50-percent shortage in needed work force will be felt in some computer specializations.

In 1982 the Committee on Microelectronics and Employment was created in order to study the consequences for Canadian workers of using microelectronic technology. The Committee's task included studying the impact of microelectronic technology on the position of office employees. It published 30 recommendations aimed at increasing the positive aspects of the impact of new technology and reducing its negative aspects.¹⁵ The most important one was the proposal to set up a center on new technology and employment to be financed by the federal government. This center should help create additional work positions by developing plans for the best possible regional distribution of microelectronic industry, offering subsidies to small and medium-sized companies to produce microelectronic equipment, and encouraging the construction of new enterprises in the regions of the country undergoing prolonged economic depression. The committee proposed that the short-term and long-term consequences of the impact of introducing microelectronics on labor productivity be studied, that the technological changes in the Canadian labor code be precisely defined, and that employers announce proposed technological changes within 180 days of their introduction instead of 90 days, as is now envisioned.

The materials of the Committee on Microelectronics and Employment noted that in the past new opportunities in the area of employment were created using technology so that society would become accustomed to economic changes in a short period of time. In order for Canada to maintain this ability in the future, a national policy in the area of scientific-technical progress and the efficient introduction of its achievements into the economy must be formulated and carried out.

Following this line, the Canadian government determined five of the most promising sectors: production of telecommunications equipment; electrical engineering industry; production of plastics and synthetic resin; smelting of nonferrous metals; and prospecting for and extracting oil.¹⁶

Back in the late 1970's, according to data from one of the surveys, 40 percent of the trade unions assumed that the technological changes would have negative consequences and 11 percent thought they would be positive; 20 percent believed that no serious consequences were foreseen; and 17 percent did not know what they would be.¹⁷ In the 1980's trade union concern over the consequences for employment of introducing new technology began to increase rapidly. "Microelectronics can lead to an 'explosion' of unemployment," said K. Maguire, a representative of the Canadian Workers Congress (CWC), "since it increases labor productivity approximately five-fold."¹⁸

In order to be able to adopt the necessary measures in advance and carry out their own policy, trade unions need access to companies' plans for technological changes. As the organ of the Canadian CP, the journal COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, writes, "Trade union activists of those enterprises where technological changes are being proposed must prepare the appropriate positions in advance, since when the question is on the agenda, it will be more difficult to solve."¹⁹

Thus, the trade unions of postal employees, railroad workers, communications workers, and many others lead the struggle with employers for the right to obtain information on changes in advance and the right to negotiate regarding labor conditions. They do not believe that it is sufficient to inform the trade union within 90 days of beginning to introduce technological changes in cases where the corporations have been formulating these changes for many years. They emphasize the need to precisely define technological changes.

The study conducted in 1978 of more than 1,000 collective contracts showed that most of them did not contain any points at all on possible technological changes. Less than 20 percent of the contracts contained points guaranteeing to maintain the wage level and extent of employment or envisioned the creation of committees of trade unions and managers to study questions of the consequences of technological changes; 44 percent envisioned one-time payments on dismissal and supplementary unemployment benefits; less than 30 percent provided for reeducation or retraining; and about 3 percent envisioned payment of benefits in order to change over to a different work position.²⁰

A study of collective contracts in 1981 corroborated the preceding conclusions. Only one-third of the basic collective contracts contained points on retraining and less than one-third had any forms of guaranteed wages

or extent of employment, while 47 percent envisioned severance pay. And the positions on benefits related to going on pension and dismissals did not always cover even workers with 30 years and more length of service.²¹

Of 200 collective contracts studied by the ministry of labor of the province of Ontario, 55.9 percent had no clauses on technological changes, 64.9 percent had no points on retraining in connection with technological changes, and 67.8 percent did not have provisions on changing over to a different work position in connection with technological changes.²²

This situation has made the problem of including a point on the impact of technological changes on employment especially urgent in Canada in the 1980's. Trade unions demand that collective contracts include detailed information related to the design, introduction, and operation of new equipment and its impact on the labor process so that they precisely stipulate questions of reeducation, change-over to other work, guarantees of wages and extent of employment, and the dismissal procedure when the trade union agrees to eliminate work positions. The Canadian CP and its branches also require that a point on the right to strike when employers and workers cannot reach a uniform opinion on the consequences of technological changes be included.

Trade unions point out the difficulties of retraining. Although new work positions are created with the spread of microcomputers, working people prove to be unprepared to fill them. However, of course, Canadian firms spend much less capital on training their workers than firms in other developed capitalist countries. Thus, while a worker in Japan is retrained on a new position for 65 hours during the year and a worker in the United States -- for 35 hours, in Canada it is only 25 hours. "In those cases where workers are dismissed as a result of technological changes, only an insignificant number of those dismissed are able to acquire a new skill without the trade union's help," said M. Idi, one of the leaders of the Canadian CP.²³ Women, young people, and persons of the older generation have especially little chance of being retrained.

Trade unions point out the negative consequences of work with visual display monitors. This work tires the eyes, irritates the skin, and causes cataracts and nervous stress. Workers suffer from monotony and isolation. Many scientists assert that the radiation put out by monitors is not safe even in the short term, and its long-term consequences are especially unclear. Therefore, scientists recommend introducing temporary rules for employers who have monitor operators working for them. These rules should include the following points: the time spent at terminals must not exceed 5 hours; a break must be taken after each hour of work; and a medical exam must be carried out at the employer's expense every year. However, in practice the scientists' recommendations have not yet become widespread.

Disputes on the effect on microelectronic technicians' health in many respects recall the debates on occupational illnesses in asbestos and uranium miners, when the government refused to acknowledge that the cause of them was the harmful nature of production and poor safety equipment. "Often workers'

demands are only taken seriously after a large percentage of them become ill or they become invalids," writes COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT.²⁴

Trade unions give special attention to the need to maintain and expand their ranks. Historically, the bourgeoisie has used new technology for the struggle with the working class. Highly skilled workers were replaced by new equipment and other less-skilled workers who were not members of the trade union. Microelectronics is now fulfilling this role. Thus, for example, the labor of typesetters -- a well-organized group of highly skilled workers -- was replaced by computer monitors. Women who are not members of the trade union are contracted for work on the monitors. Each time employers have used such tactics in the past, the trade union movement took countermeasures, combining the ranks of the working class and recruiting new detachments of working people into its organization. The same thing is observed in our day. Trade unions, especially those whose members must suffer from new technological changes most of all, are conducting an active campaign to expand and consolidate their ranks.

At its national congress in 1982 the Canadian CP adopted the "Technological Bill of Rights." The Canadian CP members demand the maximal guarantee to maintain employment for those workers whose labor is changing in content in connection with new processes. The bill questions the traditional rights of managers to personally control technological changes and demands that trade unions be granted the right to participate in evaluating and selecting new technology. The demand is being advanced that managers report intended technological changes 2 years ahead and fully disclose the content of these changes.

In order to formulate the trade union movement's uniform strategy, seminars, conferences, and symposiums of trade unions devoted to studying the impact of introducing microelectronics on employment were organized in the early 1980's; they showed that the problems being studied went beyond the confines of theoretical disputes and general statements and acquired a practical character in different sectors of the economy and different regions for different categories of people employed.

Predominant among the demands presented by the trade unions in the early 1980's were those such as reduced work time without lower wages, an improved system of vocational training and retraining, the right to strike over technological changes during the period a collective contract is in effect, payment of the cost of moving to a new dwelling place for a worker who is forced to do so in order not to become unemployed as a result of technological changes, and no further introduction of monitors until it is proven that they are safe.

In 1983-1984 trade unions directed special attention to the need to give extensive publicity to the negative consequences of introducing microelectronics, protect the rights of trade union members, and regulate the introduction of new equipment.

Canadian communists are devoting a great deal of attention to new technology's impact on the position of working people. This problem is constantly

discussed in the pages of the communist press. "People develop microelectronic equipment and technology for specific purposes," writes COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, "and the consequences of introducing them depend on who controls them and for what purpose they are being introduced."²⁵

The Canadian CP appeals to working people to struggle to gain control over new technology and to struggle for new relations in production. Only then will the achievements of science and technology become the property of the entire society and serve its welfare.

FOOTNOTES

1. QUEEN'S QUARTERLY, Kingston, Vol 90, No 3, 1983, p 779.
2. H. Menzies, "Computers on the Job: Surviving Canada's Microcomputer Revolution," Toronto, 1982, p 14.
3. CANADIAN LABOUR, Ottawa, Vol 27, No 9, 1982, p 16.
4. Ibid., No 1, p 17.
5. H. Menzies, op. cit., p 129.
6. G. Laxer, "Canada's Economic Strategy," Toronto, 1981, p 130.
7. "Canada," Paris: OECD, 1981, p 13.
8. At the same time the proportion of expenditures for scientific research and development fell from 1.21 percent of gross national product in 1970 to 0.94 percent of gross national product in 1979. Meanwhile, in Japan, for example, this proportion rose from 1.8 to 2.04 percent of gross national product. "The Politics of Canadian Public Policy," Toronto, 1983, p 99.
9. B.I. Alekhin, "Kanada: monopolii i nauchnaya politika gosudarstva" [Canada: Monopolies and the State Science Policy], Moscow, 1982, p 55.
10. COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, Toronto, Vol 16, No 4, 1984, p 7.
11. "Work in the Canadian Context," Toronto, 1981, p 198.
12. Ibid., p 200.
13. H. Menzies, "Women and the Chip. Case Studies of the Effects of Informatics on Employment in Canada," Montreal, 1981, p 27.
14. QUEEN'S QUARTERLY, Kingston, Vol 90, No 3, 1983, p 785.
15. MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW, Washington, Vol 106, No 10, 1983, p 25.

16. SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY, London, Vol 9, No 6, 1982, p 309.
17. S. Peitchinis, "The Attitude of Trade Unions Toward Technological Change," Ottawa, 1981, p 36.
18. CANADIAN LABOUR, Ottawa, Vol 27, No 1, 1982, p 17.
19. COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, Toronto, Vol 14, No 1, 1982, p 12.
20. H. Menzies, "Computers on the Job...", op. cit., p 145.
21. "New Technologies: Their Impact on Employment and the Working Environment," Geneva, 1982, p 85.
22. COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, Toronto, Vol 14, No 1, 1982, p 12.
23. CANADIAN LABOUR, Ottawa, Vol 27, No 1, 1982, p 19.
24. COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, Toronto, Vol 14, No 1, 1982, p 10.
25. COMMUNIST VIEWPOINT, Vol 14, No 1, p 12.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

THE VATICAN'S PAST, PRESENT POLICY ON LIBERATION THEOLOGY VIEWED

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 125-137

[Article by Leonid Dmitriyevich Khodorkovskiy, doctor of historical sciences and senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement, under the rubric "The Struggle of Ideas in the Contemporary World": "The Vatican and the Social Question in the 1980's (On Certain Social Policy Trends of the Current Pontificate)"]

[Text] The joint actions of the broad masses of working people, atheists and believers, Marxists and Catholics, and representatives of other creeds are of major significance in solving the global problems facing mankind. In the last decades positive advances have been noted in the cause of uniting them. Above all this concerns the struggle against the danger of a new world war, which threatens the destruction of life on the planet. Hundreds of millions of people with different worldviews and dissimilar systems of values and ideas on ways to resolve urgent tasks are participating in the movement for the prevention of a universal thermonuclear conflict, disarmament, and detente. The prospects for joint actions of the masses have also taken on realistic contours in other spheres -- in the struggle for social progress and social justice and against the predatory old world economic order, hunger and illness, the poisoning of the environment, and so forth.

It is apparent that in the conditions which have developed, it makes a difference which positions are taken by the leadership levels of various faiths who, though unable to fully control the public behavior of the believing masses, nonetheless have a strong stimulative or, in contrast, inhibiting effect on them. In the article below we will discuss the positions on the problems of poverty, inequality, oppression, and exploitation of working people, including the working class, held by those who occupy the apex of the Catholic Church -- one of the most massive ideological trends in many developed capitalist and developing countries.

Two competing trends have taken shape recently at the summit of the Catholic Church: the conservative (integralist) trend, which opposes adapting church structures and policies to changing reality, and the modernist (restorationist) trend, which defends the need to deal with actual changes occurring in the world and to take account of social changes and processes in the consciousness of the believing masses. Disagreements between these two

trends encompass a broad range of questions, both ritual and content questions. They are even spreading to the social sphere. Moreover, there is every reason to assert that throughout the entire 20th century, disagreements on social questions (on the church's attitude toward the working masses of the population who are economically and socially discriminated against, and toward the population's struggle for justice and social and political emancipation) between the competing trends in the Catholic Church have steadily increased and have now become prevalent.

For this entire century the positions of the official leadership of the Catholic Church have represented a certain form of compromise between the two trends. Inasmuch as the church could not fail to change somewhat without risking losing contact with the main mass of its supporters, it was forced to one extent or another to deal with the restorationists' proposals and try to realize them. In the field of social policy, the Papal Encyclicals "Rerum novarum" and "Quadragesimo anno,"* universally accepted as the Vatican's forced reaction to the development of capitalism and exacerbation of the social contradictions inherent in it, served as a reflection of this process at the turn of the 20th century and in its first third.

The continuous prevalence of the integralist forces over the restorationist forces was a feature of the compromise between the integralist and restorationist trends for a substantial part of the Catholic Church's history in modern and very recent times. To a significant degree this predetermined the series of defeats which the Catholic Church suffered in the ideological struggle for the masses in the 19th and early 20th centuries,² and which was expressed in particular in Catholicism's sharply weakened influence on the workers, especially in Central and Southwestern Europe. The situation of integralist predominance over the restorationists, which had already become traditional, changed only in 1958 with the start of the pontificate of A.D. Roncalli, who came to the papal throne under the name of John the 23rd. The new head of the Catholic Church convened the 2nd Vatican Council, one of whose tasks was to reform the Code of Canonical Law -- a unique type of supreme legal document of the Catholic Church. The supporters of the restorationist trend prevailed at the council. John the 23rd himself actively helped strengthen the restorationist ideas by publishing two extremely important ecclesiastical epistles, "Mater et magistra" and "Pacem in terris", one after the other.³

The first epistle contained an attempt to evaluate from a restorationist standpoint the changes which had occurred in the world in the 70 years since the time the encyclical "Rerum novarum" was published. As compared with preceding papal epistles, "Mater et magistra" contained a number of statements which were unusual for the Catholic Church. For the obvious purpose of maintaining and when possible expanding Catholicism's influence among the workers, it praised the development of social security and trade union activities and the state's greater role in managing the economy and solving social problems. The orientation to the "natural right" of private property, usual for the Catholic Church, was accompanied by recognition of the acceptability of state ownership of the implements of labor if they are a source of economic strength which cannot be put into the hands of private citizens "without endangering the common good." The encyclical unequivocally

condemned colonialism and neocolonialism as well as the disastrous situation of the peasantry, mainly in economically backward countries. An important feature of the document was its lack of direct attacks against socialism, communism, and Marxism, which abounded in the epistles of John the 23rd's predecessors.⁴ Moreover, despite all the many reservations, he allowed Catholics to enter into relations with persons "with other views on life." By this he meant above all communists, contacts with whom had been prohibited under threat of excommunication since 1949.⁵

The second epistle was mainly devoted to the problems of preserving peace. Many positions of this epistle sound as if they were formulated in the mid-1980's, not more than 20 years ago. "It has become the custom," the epistle says, for example, "to justify the arms race with words to the effect that in present conditions peace can be insured only through parity of armed forces. But in the case where one particular country increases its military potential, other countries must also not lag behind but arm themselves. And if one country produces an atomic weapon, then others must also produce atomic weapons with the same destructive force. As a result, people live under constant fear, expecting a hurricane that can break out at any moment bringing with it unimaginable suffering."⁶

The epistle's author proposed settling disputes by peaceful means, on the basis of the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The encyclical spoke more definitively than previous documents of a dialogue between Catholics and the adherents of other faiths as well as with atheists.

A bitter campaign was launched against the positions contained in both encyclicals. And despite traditionalism, the integralists who were behind it did resort to direct attacks on the pope, which are condemned by Catholic dogma. John the 23rd was branded the "Red pope", "procommunist," and so forth. But in reality the then head of the Catholic Church had no intention of shattering the foundations of the Catholic Church. He did not change its dogma, nor its theological precepts, nor the organizational forms which had developed. He simply made its struggle for the souls of simple people, workers, and peasants more effective by helping "create the prerequisites for transforming the authoritarian church machine, closely linked to the interests of extreme reaction, into a more liberal organism, more in keeping with contemporary conditions and acting with due regard for the aspirations of many millions of Catholics, not only in Western Europe and the United States but also in the developing countries, for a stable peace and social progress."⁷

The trend toward restoration remained decisive even after John the 23rd's death in 1963 under his successor D.B. Montini (Pope Paul the 6th). Among other things, the next papal encyclical, "Ecclesiam suam," dated August 1964, attested to this. The encyclical's main theme was the need for a dialogue between the Catholic Church and those outside it, including atheists. Its supporters were directed to enter into conversation with the external world without anathema and censure, maintaining needed caution so as not to weaken the obligations imposed by faith.

The 2nd Vatican Council, which completed its work under Paul the 6th, marked the victory of the restorationists. The so-called ecclesiastical constitution "The Church in the Contemporary World" (*Gaudium et spes*) adopted by the council is very instructive in this regard. It emphasized that the Church does not consider itself to be connected with any political, economic, or social system. This constitution was interpreted as an attempt to disassociate from the orientation of the Catholic Church to capitalist social relations, which was unacceptable for many working Catholics.

Taking into account the sentiments of a significant part of the believers who were workers, in its treatment of property the constitution acknowledged, in the spirit of John the 23rd's statements, the legality not only of private but state and social forms of property and sanctioned passing private property into the hands of the state "with fair compensation." For the first time an official document of the Catholic Church not only acknowledged the need for a dialogue between believers and nonbelievers but also for cooperation between them in achieving fairer living conditions for people. This acknowledgement was a step forward in comparison to the tactics of the dialogue proposed in the encyclical "*Ecclesiam suam.*"⁸

By the day the council closed, the so-called Congregation of the Holy Chancellory, which played the role of supreme "keeper of the purity of the Catholic faith" and was in the hands of integralists who had turned it into a tool of punishment for all heretics, had been reorganized by papal decree. It was renamed the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and its functions were substantially curtailed. In mid-1966 the list of prohibited books, which was of long tradition, was abolished; this meant the de facto abolishment of church censorship.

Nonetheless, soon after the work of the 2nd Vatical Council was completed, it became apparent that the restorationists' victory over the integralists was not complete, let alone final. The struggle between them continued in the Roman Curia and in national episcopates and had varying success. Two directions were articulated and developed during this struggle. On the one hand, the integralists launched an attack on the council's decisions, attempting to prevent them from being implemented in practice, change the ratio of forces in the entire Catholic Church to their favor, and take revenge for earlier defeats. On the other hand, in a number of countries, especially developing countries, the documents approved by the council incited and acted as a stimulus for the appearance of trends which went beyond the confines of restoration. These trends, which directly reflected the expectations of the unfortunate masses of Catholic working people , went much further than seemed admissible to the moderate restorationists and started to elaborate positions formulated by the council in the spirit of advocating fundamental social transformations and implementing them in any way possible, including by force. On the ideological-theoretical level the views of these trends were formulated in the "theology of liberation" and the "theology of revolution."

Trends taking the positions of the "theology of liberation" became particularly widespread in the countries of Latin America, where the influence of the Catholic Church remained very substantial but the impoverishment of the popular masses had assumed especially unbearable forms. As a result, certain

views which developed within the framework of the "theology of liberation" were adopted by some of the leaders of the Latin American Catholic Church. In this way they hoped to weaken the influence of consistent advocates of the "theology of liberation" and at the same time impede further radicalization of the Catholic masses and their shift to consistent revolutionary positions.

The situation which developed in the Catholic Church in most Latin American countries forced the Vatican to publish a document whose initial purpose was to restrain the radical trends within the framework of the restorationist trend. This document was the papal epistle "Populorum progressio," published in March 1967.

In certain respects this epistle went much further than the previous ones. Stating that in certain countries part of the population lived miserably in conditions unfit for human beings, it declared this situation extremely dangerous. In order to avoid the victory of "totalitarian" (read: truly revolutionary) ideologies which was possible in such conditions, fundamental social transformations were needed. Inasmuch as these transformations inevitably involve forceful interference with property, the epistle did not exclude such types of actions, acknowledging that the general good sometimes necessitates expropriation. Moreover, despite its general antirevolutionary orientation, the epistle allowed the "legality of revolutionary actions" against obvious and prolonged tyranny which has flagrantly violated basic human rights and harmed the general welfare of the country to a dangerous extent. Although the epistle also condemned "material and atheistic philosophy," with particular insistence it again appealed to Catholics to cooperate with all people of good will, with no exceptions whatsoever.

The response to the encyclical "Populorum progressio" among the Catholic masses and the lower clergy was significant, but its impact proved to be different from what the Vatican expected. Not only did it fail to restrain the left-radical forces of Catholicism within the framework of moderate restoration but, on the contrary, it seemed to untie the hands of those who genuinely saw the church's calling as concern for the welfare of poor working people -- the workers and peasants. Relying on the encyclical, the adherents of the "theology of liberation" moved even further to the left.

In the situation which developed, the Vatican made the decision to freeze restorationist aspirations, slow down the process of adapting the Catholic Church to the realities of the contemporary world and, by taking in hand the representatives of the lower clergy who had been disobedient, begin a steady retreat, if not to initial positions at least in their direction.

In this sense the course of events at the second general meeting of Latin American bishops, held in the city of Medellin (Colombia) in 1968, was very instructive. Inasmuch as, in the Vatican's opinion, a danger existed that under pressure from the lower strata this meeting might adopt dangerous decisions, it was attended by Paul the 6th, who timed his journey to Latin America to coincide with this event. On 24 August 1968 he appeared before the participants of the meeting with a long speech which came down on church "rebels." Among them he classified those who challenge the church leadership, adhere to "fashionable" philosophical trends, and defend freedom of opinion in

the church. Those who took certain radical positions of the encyclical seriously and tried to combine Catholic faith with revolution were especially condemned. "We cannot identify ourselves with systems and structures which shield and pander to unworthy and oppressive inequality among the classes and the citizens of one country or another and do not carry out effective measures to improve the unbearable conditions from which the poorest part of the population suffers," said Paul the 6th. "Nonetheless, we once again repeat that the strength of our mercy is not hatred and not force. Among the various paths which lead to a just social rebirth, we cannot choose either atheistic Marxism or systematic rebellion, and surely not the path of blood or anarchy..."⁹ It is sufficient to compare this quotation with the thesis of the encyclical "Populorum progressio" cited above in order to be convinced of the Roman pontiff's retreat to the more traditional positions of the Catholic Church on the question of social transformations. Other speeches by Paul the 6th during his stay in Latin America were also couched in this spirit.

However, they did not manage to turn development back, despite the fact that the militant integralists and moderate restorationists united to strive for this change. In decisions adopted by the general meeting of bishops in Medellin, despite the embittered opposition of part of the episcopate, the church's obligation to act on the side of the poor and for the liberation of the oppressed was especially recorded.¹⁰

The advocates of the "theology of liberation" had no reason to be fully satisfied with the conference's results. However, apparently believing that anything was better than nothing, they proclaimed the decisions of the conference of the Catholic archbishops of Latin America a symbol of the emergence of a "new church" which refused to support the powers that be and had switched to the people's side.¹¹ Some of the young priests who were close to their poor congregations ignored the threatening notes which sounded in the pope's speech and interpreted these decisions as a sanction to carry out a more decisive and active policy in support of the people's economic and sociopolitical demands. Some of them came even closer to the left-oriented political movement, aiding their struggle against reactionary, dictatorial regimes. Among them were people such as Camilo Torres, for example; these people gave up the cloth, joined partisan detachments, and were killed in battles with government troops.¹²

Most of the Latin American episcopate in turn interpreted the decisions of the general council in Medellin as merely a verbal compromise to popular sentiments which did not at all require the standing socioeconomic and political precepts of the church to be changed. In response to the pressure of the adherents of the "theology of liberation", they moved even more to the right. They began to more and more actively use the means they had to keep the Catholic lower strata in check. Dictatorial regimes and the right-conservative forces which supported them took the role of allies of this part of the episcopate. An intensive defamatory campaign was launched against Catholic activists and priests who had adopted an orientation in support of the poor; during this campaign leftist Catholics were accused of "subversive activities," "revolutionary activities," and "ties with communists."

In this situation, the first summary works which presented the basic postulates of the "theology of liberation" appeared in the early 1970's. In 1971, "The Theology of Liberation" by Gustavo Guttierrez was published in Peru,¹³ and in 1972, "Jesus Christ the Liberator" by Leonardo Boff -- in Brazil.¹⁴ Juan-Luis Segundo (Uruguay), Raul Vidales (Mexico), and Miguel Bonino and Enrico Dussell (Argentina) presented their views. In Western Europe ideas which were close to the "theology of liberation" were presented by the French theologian P. Bigo¹⁵ and the West German theologian T. Rendtorff.¹⁶ The main positions of the "theology of liberation" were covered in a multitude of popular publications.

The basic program precepts of this theology appear this way in G. Guttierrez' account¹⁷: a new religious system of views is needed which would reflect revolutionary practices; these practices permit methods of revolutionary struggle even to the point of armed struggle; the new religious system must be tied to the major social changes of the epoch; it should be based on the social sciences and above all on "Marxist thought" oriented to the practice and focused on the transformation of the world; performance of duty stemming from the needs of the struggle for liberation must be made paramount, and only then Christian duty viewed from the standpoint of theology. Subsequently, in developing these positions, G. Guttierrez came to the conclusion that the masses who are socially discriminated against are members of one social class being exploited by another class and that the task of the struggle for liberation, in which the Catholic Church must be included, presupposes the need to "speak out against whatever gives rise to the exploitation of man by man."¹⁸

Of course, there are many inaccurate evaluations and positions in the "theology of liberation," even if it is considered in its most radical variant as presented by G. Guttierrez. Its interpretation of Marxism is one-sided and therefore distorted. An understanding of the vanguard role of the working class is alien to its supporters. The opposition of the tasks of national and social liberation, the study of processes occurring on the Latin American continent, out of touch with the world revolutionary process, and so on are inherent in the "theology of liberation."¹⁹ Despite its sometimes radical content, the "theology of liberation" nonetheless remains a part of the religious worldview, since it is based on the assertion that faith is the main source of all knowledge and experience.²⁰ All this, however, does not make it any less "red" in the eyes of the reactionary wing of the Catholic Church.

In the complex situation where Catholicism found itself at that time, the Roman Curia did not decide to force the change which was clearly foreshadowed in Paul the 6th's speeches mentioned above. The encyclical dated 1975, "Evangelii nuntiandi" can be considered a typical example of this. Priests and congregations were cautioned, on the one hand, against a narrow understanding of the church's calling, and, on the other -- against focusing on certain spiritual problems and against lack of interest in world issues. This was clear reference to the fact that the Roman Curia did not consider it possible to make a public choice between those who saw their duty in struggling to satisfy the particular demands of the popular masses and those who condemned such a struggle, considering exclusively "spiritual" activism the church's sphere of activity.

Nonetheless, an internal choice was obviously made. It is precisely from this viewpoint that the measures to strengthen ideological discipline adopted at that time should be considered. Thus, in the mid-1970's, the Vatican undertook efforts to revive the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which had not been particularly active after the 2nd Vatican Council. The International Commission of Theologians was formed under its aegis and was charged with giving an opinion on the problem of the "relationship of human welfare and Christian salvation", that is, on the very question which became the theoretical watershed between the advocates of the "church of the poor" and the orthodox-conservative circles. The basic idea was to officially proclaim the indisputable preeminence of the functions of "Christian salvation" and put aside, if not eliminate completely, the tasks of the struggle for the vital interests of workers and peasants and for social justice, to which the leftist Catholics gave preference.

It is true that the commission's work did not go smoothly. The sharpness of the disputes which arose in it can be judged if nothing else by the fact that it took nearly two years to work out a document on this topic that suited the majority of its members. Moreover, the document itself, the result of such lengthy debates, bore obvious features of compromise. It did not contain any open condemnation of the "theory [sic] of liberation," although it did say that certain positions of this theology require "further consideration" and that the advocates of this direction when utilizing "other theories and analyses" should bear in mind that they "can involve values which are incompatible with church values."²¹ Nonetheless, the very fact of the creation of a central organ with the right, relying on the Vatican's authority, to determine what the Catholics of the entire world, regardless of their qualifications and position in the church hierarchy, can and cannot say attested to the fact the movement back toward the times before the 2nd Vatican Council had already attained substantial scope.

No less instructive was the attack, clearly inspired from above, on the "theology of liberation" which was being carried out unofficially. In 1973 Latin American and West German integralist-theologians organized a so-called study group which assumed the task of examining a number of pressing theological issues. The significance which was attached to this group can be judged if only by the fact that figuring among its active members and patrons were such prominent representatives of the Catholic hierarchy as the archbishop of Medellin, Cardinal Alphonso Lopez Trujillo, and the Essen bishop F. Hengsbach. From the depths of this group came a number of critical materials which not only questioned the validity of the main positions of the "theology of liberation" but also questioned the possibility of combining support of this theology with life in the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Nonetheless, while the Roman curia did not show external restraint on this question, the activities of the study group could not lead -- and did not lead -- to any substantial changes. This can be judged if only by the fact that one-third of the general meeting of Latin American bishops held in 1979 in Pueblo, despite the fierce attacks of the integralists and their allies among the "moderate" restorationists, favored an "orientation to the poor" and a number of positions developed by the "theology of liberation" were included in

the documents of the meeting. The legitimacy of this theology as a competent direction in the framework of at least the Latin American Catholic Church thus got some, though not complete, official confirmation.²²

Meanwhile, the ratio of forces in the Roman Curia itself went through a significant change. In 1978 Paul the 6th died. After the brief pontificate of John Paul the 1st, Cardinal Woityla (Pope John Paul the 2nd) came to the Roman throne. Inasmuch as the role of the pope in the Catholic hierarchy is decisive, the position of the new Roman pontiff inevitably had an effect on the unstable equilibrium which existed under Paul the 6th.

However, this position was by no means defined immediately. On the one hand, in Vatican circles the new pope was considered a conservative rather than a modernist, and, on the other, the first documents which came from his pen did not yet justify a final evaluation.

One of the most important acts of John Paul the 2nd in the early years of his pontificate was the publication of a new variant of Catholicism's social doctrine, given in the encyclical "Laborem exercens," which coincided with the 90th anniversary of the first social encyclical -- "Rerum novarum."²³ The content of this document was of a dual nature. Comparing it with social doctrines formulated in the late 19th and first third of the 20th centuries, it could be considered a departure from the most extreme forms of the conservative vision of reality. To some extent the new encyclical took into account those changes which occurred and are occurring in the surrounding world (including the social and political upsurge of colonial and dependent peoples, the consequences of the present stage of the scientific-technical revolution, and so on). The encyclical lacked open attacks on socialism as a form of social organization and attacks against communist parties and the countries of real socialism. It also did not include a direct ban on supporters of the Catholic Church participating in social and political movements together with socialists and communists.²⁴

At the same time, a comparison of this document with the encyclicals which came out under the popes John the 23rd and Paul the 6th gave every reason to conclude that the movement backwards which had already begun under Pope Paul the 6th was continuing, slowly but surely.

In accordance with the main goal which the encyclical pursued, it focuses on the problem of labor. It emphasizes that labor represents the core and key problem of the "social question." And labor not only has a definite significance as a condition of the creation of the goods necessary for man's existence but also as a factor which forms the personality.

Focusing attention on this undoubtedly important aspect of the matter, the epistle's author tried at the same time to suggest the idea that the material essence of labor is secondary in significance. From this the conclusion was drawn that the actual relations which people enter into in the process of labor cannot serve as the main criterion when evaluating the situation which exists in society. It is much more important that these people engage in labor as such and, consequently, are associated with the realization of its main ethical function. In other words, class distinctions stemming from the

relations of the property and position of a person in the social division of labor are nothing in comparison to the fact that a member of society is improved morally and ethically to one extent or another by engaging in any activity.

In complete accordance with this approach, criticism of the prophets of the capitalist system was substantially weakened in the encyclical. Only "strict capitalism," but not social relations based on the exploitation of man by man, was condemned. The division and opposition of labor and capital appeared not as a consequence of the development of capitalist relations but as a result of an "error of common sense" called "economism." According to the logic of the epistle's author, this "error" needs only to be eliminated for labor and capital in friendly unity to solve the "social question" in all its aspects.

The epistle did not directly refute the earlier-acknowledged thesis of the possibility in "certain cases" of establishing public ownership of the means of labor and the admissibility of workers participating in managing production. Nonetheless, the document gave main emphasis to the assertion that agreement to establish public ownership of the means of production has strictly delineated limits and must not be interpreted as the adoption of the Marxist thesis on the need to socialize the basic means of production. And it especially emphasized that reforms which had become necessary could not be achieved as a result of the a priori destruction of property, since the means of production confiscated from the hands of owners will inevitably become the property of organized society and, consequently, will fall under the control of the groups of people who possess power -- an argument which from time immemorial the advocates of capitalism (including "strict" capitalism) have advanced in the struggle to keep the levers of economic power in their hands.

The encyclical viewed relations between labor and capital through the prism of the need for cooperation dictated by their unity in production. The recommendations to working people arise from this: reject all forms of class confrontation. Instead of the "struggle focused against others," it is recommended that workers and their occupational organizations try to achieve "justice and good" rather than show "egoism." For this same purpose the encyclical advanced the demand to depoliticize trade unions and above all distance them from workers parties.²⁵

John Paul the 2nd expressed similar ideas at the 68th session of the International Organization of Labor (July 1982).²⁶

The integralist trend in the Catholic Church interpreted the encyclical "Laborem exercens" with restrained satisfaction, praising the changed emphasis characteristic of it as compared to the documents of the times of John the 23rd and Paul the 6th. In leftist Catholic circles, this circumstance, in contrast, caused concern. Nonetheless, inasmuch as the backward movement recorded by the encyclical was not extremely abrupt, it was not interpreted as evidence of a final turnaround. The most widespread viewpoint amounted to the assertion that the papal epistle was a compromise document which came out of the core of the centrist group of the elite of the Catholic clergy, who were in this way attempting to weaken the centrifugal tendency discussed above.

Nonetheless, the further things went, the stronger indications became that it might be a matter of much more than a change in emphasis. As an example, the fact that the replacement of the head of the Vatican was accompanied by increasing consolidation of the position of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith drew the fixed attention of the restorationist faction and, even more so, of leftist Catholic circles. From organizing debates enlisting theologian specialists, the Congregation shifted to applying increasingly harsh sanctions. In late 1979 it condemned the well-known Catholic theologian Hans Kueng, who allowed himself to question some Catholic dogma, including the "infallibility of the pope." The same year the book by the French theologian J. Poet was condemned for "dangerous assertions" which could cause "doubt regarding the basic tenets of the faith" in believers. Similar accusations were made against the most prominent representative of the restorationist trend, the Dutch theologian Schillebeks.²⁷

It was natural to expect that the revitalized Congregation would not bypass the "theology of liberation," which had caused so much concern for the conservative wing of the Catholic Church. And in fact, on the threshold of 1980, they demanded written explanations from L. Boff regarding his attitude toward a number of articles of church doctrine. At the same time it was proposed that the episcopal conference of Peru study the theological views of G. Guttierrez.²⁸ In January 1984 the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Ratzinger, published in the Peruvian journal OIGA an anonymous article containing sharp attacks on the "theology of liberation" as a whole. This same article, but now with a mention of the author's name, was reproduced by the Italian conservative journal 30 JORNI, which is close to the Roman Curia, and then reprinted in the extreme right West German journal NOVYY PORYADOK. The sharpest attacks on the "theology of liberation" were heard in Ratzinger's foreword to his article in NOVYY PORYADOK. The dissemination of the views of the leading representatives of this theology on all spheres of church life, the foreword asserted, may not only shake its foundations but also "silently turn the church into its antithesis."²⁹ Finally, in the second half of 1984, L. Boff was personally summoned to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which usually precedes far-reaching organizational conclusions. Everything indicated that under the new pontificate the reservedly negative attitude toward the "theology of liberation" was yielding to open persecution and that its representatives faced difficult times.

The document which commenced the official persecution of the advocates of the "church of the poor" was the Instruction of the Roman Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Several Aspects of the Theology of Liberation." It was published in the semiofficial Vatican organ L'OSERVATORE ROMANO.³⁰ The Instruction represented a systematic and very complete summary of accusations and statements against the "theology of liberation" by its integralist opponents over the preceding 15 years. In view of the acuteness of the problem of liberation, we read in this document, "some people are trying to put one-sided emphasis on liberation on earth, in the worldly sense. As a result, the impression arises that they attach secondary importance to liberation from sin, and thereby in fact do not assign it its proper, decisive place." All this is fraught with the temptation to "reduce the Gospel of Salvation to the earthly Gospel."³¹

In other words, the first danger the document warns of is that people have appeared in the bosom of the Catholic Church who assign earthly matters a no less important place than other-worldly matters.

A second danger also exists. Some (that is, the advocates of the "theology of liberation") "attempting to correctly understand the causes of enslavement which they would like to eliminate and without showing sufficient critical caution, utilize spiritual instruments which can only with difficulty (or most likely not at all) be cleansed of ideological notions incompatible with the Christian faith and with the demands stemming from it."³² In order to avoid any doubt of the meaning of this reproof, its content is made more concrete: "Impatience and desire for action have forced some Christians who are disappointed in all other methods to turn to what they call 'Marxist analysis.'" However, the authors of the document threaten, Marxism is a worldview in whose framework observed facts and results of analysis are integrated into a philosophical-ideological structure which from the very beginning predetermines the meaning and relative weight to be attached to each of the facts. Therefore, one cannot extract the heterogeneous elements which form it from Marxism. A person who expects to take from it only what is needed for analysis finds himself, by the same token, faced with accepting its ideology as well. At the same time, Marxism "defends basic theses which are incompatible with the Christian interpretation." This concerns both the atheism of Marxism and its "contempt for the human individual."³³

In this connection, it should obviously be recalled that the documents published in the years of the pontificates of John the 23rd and Paul the 6th also contained warnings against "fascination with Marxist analysis." Of course, these warnings were not of such an aggressive nature and were not formulated in such a way as to be interpreted as a ban on cooperation with Marxists.

The document attributes a total of 16 sins and heresies to the "theology of liberation." The accusation of a "totalitarian nature," which is inferred from this theology's acknowledgement of the significance of the class struggle, occupies one of the central positions among them. The authors of the document assert that this undermines the universality of the ecclesiastical principle of "love for one's neighbor and brotherhood." It engenders illusory expectations of violent methods in attempts to "attain greater justice." "The urgent need for radical reforms of those structures which generate poverty and themselves represent a form of violence," the document says, "must not be the reason for ignoring the fact that the source of injustice is in the heart of man. Social changes which would in reality serve to the benefit of man will be implemented only as a result of an appeal to man's ethical capabilities and to his genuine internal transformation."³⁴ It is this, and only this, they say, with which the church must concern itself.

In analyzing the Instruction of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, one other rather important circumstance is striking. All the documents of the Catholic Church of the last 2 decades which concern social issues have

contained criticism of capitalism or, in any case, its particular negative manifestations. But in the Instruction it is completely lacking. And, on the contrary, for the first time in many years there are direct flagrant attacks on the countries of real socialism in an official document of the Roman Curia. In the spirit of the most unbridled anticommunism, they are declared the "shame of our time." Correspondingly, leftist Catholics, including the advocates of the "theology of liberation," are accused, since they are the allies of the communists, of "betraying the poor who, they assert, they intend to serve." The authors of the Instruction naturally understood that the position they defend can be and will be interpreted as an appeal to the Catholic Church of Latin America to reject any type of opposition to reactionary, dictatorial regimes established on the Latin American continent and, moreover, to take up the path of greater cooperation with them. In order to avoid such an impression, which is extremely unfavorable to the Vatican, the text of the Instruction inserted the reservation: "A warning against dangerous errors which are inherent in certain directions of the theology of liberation must not to any extent be viewed as even indirect support of those who help keep the people in need, make money off them, or are indifferent to the fact that they exist."³⁵

This reservation contradicted the basic orientation of the document to such a degree that it could not be taken seriously even by people who were sympathetic to Vatican policies. "Do they really understand in Rome what a weapon they are thereby giving to dictatorial political systems?" wrote the West German theologian Peter Huenermann, commenting on the Instruction.³⁶

Inasmuch as the Instruction of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith does not have the weight in the Catholic Church that the papal epistles do and its content can be disputed, its publication was accompanied by a note which said: "This Instruction, adopted at the Congregation's regular meeting during an audience granted by the cardinal-prefect of Pope John Paul the 2nd, who signed it, found his approval and is published in accordance with his instructions."³⁷ After the Instruction was published in the Western press, which was very interested in the development of events in the Catholic Church, there was lively discussion of why the Roman Curia, which had adopted the decision to shift to open attack on the "theology of liberation," resorted to such an unusual method as the publication of the Instruction. Indeed, it would have been much simpler and more efficient to once and for all condemn this theology in a regular papal epistle. The most probable explanation proposed in this connection was as follows. The Instruction served as a kind of trial balloon. It was proposed to use it to identify the reaction of the Catholic clergy and flock, mainly in the countries of Latin America, to a conservative revision of the Catholic Church's social doctrine and settle accounts with leftist trends in the sphere of its influence, without the direct intervention of its pontiff.

The months that followed the publication of the Instruction showed, however, that these calculations were unjustified. Despite the reference to papal support, it encountered decisive opposition not only from leftist Catholics but also from some of the moderate restorationist circles, who were afraid that the weapon used against the "theology of liberation" could soon be used against them. Many representatives of the "theology of liberation" openly

announced that they would pay no mind to the Instruction, which was not a formally compulsory document. This in turn forced the Vatican to take one more step. In mid-December 1984 John Paul the 2nd published an apostolic epistle devoted to the question of "reconciliation and repentance." A number of problems discussed in the Instruction were examined once again in it. Although the epistle did not reproduce the most serious accusations against the "theology of liberation," there can be no doubt of the basic meaning of the document. Rejecting the main positions of this theology, the pope repeated over and over that the class struggle which is comparatively broadly acknowledged in our time in certain circles is a concept based "on non-Christian ideologies and systems" which represents a "social evil" threatening "freedom and peace between individuals, groups of people, and peoples." Catholics who do not wish to consider this type of threat, the pope very significantly asserted, help preserve the tension caused, in his opinion, by secret or openly propagandized plans with the goal of "subjugating all peoples to regimes who do not believe in God."³⁸ In this way, the main conclusions of the Instruction, including the openly anticommunist attacks, found confirmation in the words of the main authority of the Catholic Church.

The speeches John Paul the 2nd gave in January-February 1985 during his sixth visit to the countries of Latin America were permeated with this same spirit.

It is still difficult to determine if the conservative forces in the Vatican and in the Catholic Church as a whole will succeed in thrusting the church back to the position which it occupied before John the 23rd's pontificate. Too much has changed in the world in past years. Nor have these changes bypassed the Catholic Church. The Catholic masses and some of the clergy do not accept the movement backwards which the top church leaders are trying to impose on them. They intend to try to solve the complex problems facing mankind, above all the problem of preserving peace and establishing social justice on earth rather than in the other world, and understand that these problems can only be solved through the joint efforts of believers and nonbelievers, Catholics and Marxists. The Vatican's attempts to ignore this circumstance can only intensify the differentiation which has been taking place in the Catholic Church for many years now and reflects the socioeconomic, political, and ideological processes occurring in the contemporary world.

FOOTNOTES

- * As a rule, encyclicals of the Roman pope are called by their initial words.
- 1. For more details, see: L.D. Khodorkovskiy, "Some Directions of the Modernization of the 'Social Doctrine' of Catholicism" in "Rabochiy klass v mirovom revolyutsionnom protsesse" [The Working Class in the World Revolutionary Process], Moscow, 1984, pp 79-92; see also: N.A. Kovalskiy, "Evolyutsiya sotsialnoy doktriny tserkvi" [The Evolution of the Church's Social Doctrine], Moscow, 1974.
- 2. See: I.R. Grigulevich, "Papstvo. Vek XX" [The Papacy. The 20th Century], Moscow, 1978.

3. See: N.A. Kovalskiy, "Katalitsizm i mirovoye sotsialnoye razvitiye" [Catholicism and World Social Development], Moscow, 1974; M.V. Andreyev, "Katalitsizm i osnovnyye problemy sovremennosti" [Catholicism and the Basic Problems of Contemporary Times], Moscow, 1973; M.P. Mchedlov, "Katalitsizm" [Catholicism], Moscow, 1974.
4. See: M.V. Andreyev, "Klerikalnyy antikommunizm" [Clerical Anticommunism], Moscow, 1977; I.Ya. Kanterov, "Klerikalnyy antikommunizm" [Clerical Anticommunism], Moscow, 1979.
5. See: I.R. Grigulevich, op. cit., p 330.
6. Ibid., p 345.
7. Ibid., p 352.
8. See: ibid., p 383.
9. Cited from I.R. Grigulevich, op. cit., p 398.
10. See: HERDER KORRESPONDENZ, October 1968, pp 491-496.
11. See: ibid.
12. See, for example: A. Delgado, "The Rebellious Padres of Latin America" in PMS, No 3, 1973; J. Rosales, "Revolution, Socialism, and Theology" in PMS, No 6, 1975; N.A. Kovalskiy, "Sotsialnaya rol' tserkvi v osvobodivshikhsya stranakh" [The Church's Social Role in Liberated Countries], Moscow, 1978.
13. See: G. Gutierrez, "Teologia de la liberacion" [The Theology of Liberation], Lima, 1971.
14. See: L. Boff, "Jesus Cristo Libertator" [Jesus Christ the Liberator], Brasilia, 1972.
15. See: P. Bigo "L'Eglise et la revolution du tiers monde", [The Church and the 3rd World Revolution], Paris, 1974.
16. See: T. Rendtorff, "Heinz Eduard Toedt. Theologie der Revolution Analisen und Materialein," Frankfurt am Main, 1970.
17. See: G. Gutierrez, op. cit.
18. See: G. Gutierrez, CONCILIUM, No 96, June 1974.
19. For more details see: N.A. Kovalskiy, "Sostialnoye rol' tserkvi...", op. cit., p 21 ff.
20. See: Gera Buentig y Catena, "Teologia, pastoral y dependencia" [Theology, the Rural, and Dependence], Guadalupe, 1974, p 20.

21. HERDER KORRESPONDENZ, January 1978, pp 24-30.
22. See: HERDER KORRESPONDENZ, April 1979, pp 214-220.
23. "The Text of 'Laborem Exercens.' An Encyclical of the Sovereign Pontiff John Paul the 2nd on Human Troubles" in LA DOCUMENTATION CATHOLIQUE, No 1815, 1981, pp 835-855.
24. See: M.P. Mchedlov, "Religion, the Church, and Policy" in KOMMUNIST, No 14, 1982, pp 90-101.
25. See: L.D. Khodorkovskiy, op. cit., pp 38-42.
26. See: "International Labor Conference. Provisional Record 21. Section 68," Geneva, 1982, pp 21/1-21/7.
27. See: V.Yu. Nyunka, "The Evolution of the Vatican's Sociopolitical Policy" in "VOPROSY NAUCHNOGO ATEIZMA, Moscow, Issue 28, 1981, p 28.
28. See: HERDER KORRESPONDENZ, June 1984, p 251.
29. HERDER KORRESPONDENZ, No 10, 1984, p 482.
30. L'OSSESSORATORE ROMANO, 9 October 1984 -- The official German translation in HERDER KORRESPONDENZ, No 10, 1984.
31. Ibid., pp 464, 468.
32. Ibid., p 464.
33. Ibid., pp 468-469.
34. Ibid., p 471.
35. Ibid., p 472.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., p 474.
38. DAS FREIE FOLK, 8 January 1985.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

12424
CSO: 1807/057

CONFERENCE ON EXPERIENCE OF WWII, CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS HELD

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 154-159

[Article by S.I. Tatishchev under the rubric "Scientific Life": "The Lessons of the War and Trade Unions"]

[Text] Four decades ago World War II, a war without historical precedent in terms of geographic scale, bitterness, human losses, and material costs, ended with the crushing defeat of German fascism and Japanese militarism. The years and the decades pass but the Soviet Union's great heroism in the battle of freedom-loving peoples against the strike force of imperialist reaction -- Hitler's fascism -- does not fade in the grateful memory of progressive mankind. The Soviet people and its Armed Forces, who carried the main burden of World War II on their shoulders, made the decisive contribution to its outcome, to victory for the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition, to the liberation of the peoples of Europe from the fascist yoke, and to saving world civilization.

The consequences of the defeat of the fascism of Hitler and his allies are so significant and many-sided that every success in revolutionary restoration of the world is in one way or another related to this great event. The victory over the sworn enemy of mankind had the most profound effect on the entire future course of world history. It created favorable conditions for the emergence and development of the world system of socialism. Having become a major factor in the consolidation of peace and a reliable mainstay of peoples fighting for complete liberation from all forms of imperialist impression, the socialist community represents the prototype of the future brotherhood of all people of labor. At the same time the Victory strengthened the positions of progressive, democratic, and peace-loving forces in the capitalist countries and promoted the rise of the workers and communist movements there and the formation of a unified anti-imperialist front aimed against the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism. It accelerated the failure of the disgraceful system of colonial oppression.

Millions of the planet's honest, progressive, and peace-loving people and national detachments of the international working class celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Victory in the critically dangerous situation which has developed as a result of the course of the United States and NATO to disrupt military-strategic parity and attain military superiority over the

USSR and over the members of the Warsaw Pact. Mankind has again been challenged, this time by the most aggressive, adventurous circles of U.S. imperialism, which has put world civilization under the threat of sliding into thermonuclear catastrophe. For the detachments of the world trade union movement defending the positions of the class struggle, the 40th anniversary of the Victory therefore became a significant occasion to again analyze the sources and causes as well as the results of World War II and to turn to its harsh and edifying lessons. In light of this, progressive trade unions begin from the fact that assimilation of the lessons of the past war give accurate reference points in the search for the solution to the problems of the present and the future in the interests of the working masses, in the name of insuring a working man's primary right -- the right to live in conditions of peace, freedom, and social justice.

The International Trade Union Conference "The 40th Anniversary of the Victory Over Fascism and Trade Unions: Historical Experience, Contemporary Problems, and the View to the Future," was held in May 1985 in Moscow under the banner of just such a principled class approach to evaluating the results and lessons of the war and consideration of it from the standpoint of the great responsibility of trade unions for defining their place as a major social force in the struggle to save civilization and life itself on earth from the threat of nuclear war and for peace and the vital interests of working people. Delegations of trade unions from 117 countries, the World Federation of Trade Unions, and other international organizations and representatives of Soviet scientific institutions took part in its work.

In opening the conference, K.Yu. Matskyavichus, AUCCTU secretary, emphasized that the further World War II withdraws into the past, the greater the force with which its impact on the entire course of history is manifested and the more deeply the world-historical meaning and significance of its lessons are revealed. Even today the historical experience of the Victory over fascism is extremely valuable for working people and for their mass organizations. It is important to the struggle for the prevention of a new world war, for peace, democracy, and social progress, and for the radiant future of working people.

A.M. Subbotin, AUCCTU secretary, gave a report "Results of World War II and the Contemporary International Trade Union Movement" at the plenary meeting of the conference. In the postwar period, he said, favorable conditions for achieving unity in the international trade union movement took shape. The Victory over fascism opened up new prospects for the development of friendship and cooperation among the peoples of the states of the anti-Hitler coalition. In October 1945 the World Federation of Trade Unions [WFTU] was organized; in its ranks it united occupational organizations of working people of many of the world's countries and of different orientations -- connected with communists, social-democrats, Catholics, and other parties. Only a few, including the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions (ICCTU), remained outside its ranks.

The creation of the WFTU was a great victory for proletarian internationalism and a success for the supporters of unity in the international workers movement. Nonetheless, from the very start its activity took place in complex conditions. The influence of "cold war" factors and the subversive work of

the leaders of the AFL and the ICCTU had an effect here. The reformist leaders of a number of Western trade union centers adopted a course to break up the WFTU and in 1949 withdrew their organizations from it and created the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). Later the ICFTU leadership officially prohibited their members from any contacts with trade unions united in the WFTU, especially with trade unions of the socialist countries. In this way, because of the reformist trade union leaders, a step backward was taken in realizing those favorable opportunities which opened up after World War II for consolidating the international trade union movement.

Nonetheless, the WFTU, as the speaker emphasized, endured the attacks of the opponents of broad trade union unity and defended a class approach to the struggle for the vital interests of working people. After 1949 the number of its member organizations almost doubled. Acting as the spokesman for the views of the progressive forces of the entire trade union movement, this largest international trade union center today represents the interests of more than 200 million working people of socialist, capitalist, and developing countries united for common class purposes.

Since the early 1950's, fundamental positive changes have occurred in the international trade union movement. They are related to the increased influence and authority of the trade unions of the socialist countries, the intensification of the anti-imperialist struggle of the trade unions of the developing countries, and the greater role of trade unions in the class struggle of working people in the countries of capital. The creation of such regional associations as the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions (ICATU), the Organization of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU), and the Standing Congress of Trade Union Unity of Latin American Working People (PKPETLA) was a manifestation in reality of the consolidation of the trade union movement. However, the opponents of unity, above all in the person of the AFL-CIO, have not stopped making attempts to poison the atmosphere in the international trade union movement, isolate the working class of the countries of the West from revolutionary ideas, and weaken international proletarian solidarity. The movement for the unity of the international trade union movement is, of course, a prolonged and complex process. But we are convinced that it can and must grow stronger. The lessons of the past, continued A.M. Subbotin, insistently remind us that it is precisely imperialism that is the socioeconomic system that engendered fascism, which was responsible for the start of World War II. In recent times American imperialism has become the main force of international reaction and militarism. The military blocks created under the aegis of the United States, the largest of which is NATO, hundreds of military bases in all corners of the globe, and ever-newer types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, that is, the entire military machine of imperialism, is focused on preparing for and carrying out aggression against the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community, suppressing the democratic and revolutionary movements in various countries, and carrying out police actions against peoples who lead the liberation struggle and spurn American dominance.

The present U.S. administration is pursuing far-reaching goals with its plans, extremely dangerous for all of mankind, for militarizing space and preparing for "star wars."

The Soviet Union has never aspired and is not aspiring to military supremacy, the speaker emphasized. But it will also not allow any other country or coalition of states to attain such supremacy; the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee again reminded us of this. The other countries of the socialist community also support this position. The arms race is alien to the very nature of socialism, which expresses the class interests of working people. And these interests have always opposed militarism. Socialism appeared under the banner of peace in the historical arena and continues to carry it high through the decades -- from Lenin's Decree on Peace to the Soviet Program of Peace for the 1980's.

Speaking of the main lesson of World War II, that we must struggle against war before it begins, A.M. Subbotin emphasized that in our day this task is especially urgent. The international trade union movement, which represents a large and influential force today, can and must play an important role in the successful resolution of this task. For Soviet trade unions and the trade unions of the socialist countries, the struggle for peace and against the arms race has always been and continues to be one of the central tasks of their activities. It is closely and inseparably related to their active struggle for the unity of the international trade union movement. Trade unions of different orientations and affiliations operating in the countries of capital have substantially increased their participation in the antiwar struggle.

Not long ago most Western trade unions still stood aside from the antiwar struggle. Today the situation has changed considerably. In their program documents they proclaim the struggle for peace one of the paramount tasks. Nonetheless, these essentially correct principles are not always corroborated in practical activities. Moreover, even today Western trade unions by no means always interpret the sources of the arms race with the proper objectivity and depth; sometimes they reveal clear anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. As the facts confirm, not all trade union associations of the West are able to withstand the evaluations of the causes of current international tension being imposed by bourgeois propaganda. Therefore, frequently one can hear of the so-called equal responsibility of the superpowers for the continuing arms race. For those who are familiar with the complex of Soviet peace proposals, the groundlessness of this thesis is clear.

While noting positive trends in trade union participation in the antiwar movement -- and it is precisely they who are predominant, it would be wrong to pass over unsolved problems. The most important one is the trade unions' lack of unity of actions in this direction. The present split in the international trade union movement prevents a general position and a program of trade union actions from being worked out.

In this connection, we must recall that it was precisely the lack of unity of the antiwar and antifascist democratic forces, including the lack of unity of the international workers movement, which in the late 1920's and early 1930's was one of the factors which helped the Nazis come to power, build up their strength, and launch the military venture which became mankind's greatest tragedy. This bitter historical lesson must not be forgotten. It confirms a simple but important truth: trade unions must put aside all differences of

opinion and leave behind all who disunite them when it is a matter of the struggle against the threat of a new war and the arms race.

Overcoming the disunity of the international trade union movement in the struggle for peace and disarmament is a timely task and the urgent issue of the day, A.M. Subbotin said in conclusion.

E. Weber, member of the SED Central Committee and of the Presidium of the Central Administration of the Association of Free German Trade Unions (AFGTU) and chairman of the central committee of the GDR Chemical, Glass, and Ceramics Industries Trade Union, devoted her speech at the plenary meeting to analyzing the position and significance of the trade unions of the socialist countries, using the trade unions of the German Democratic Republic as an example, and their role in the struggle for the preservation of peace and for social progress. The life of the people of the GDR, she noted, is forever firmly tied to the world-historical liberating heroism of the Soviet Union and its victorious army. Our people were given the opportunity to put an end to imperialism, militarism, and fascism once and for all and to join the path of social progress. When this historical turn was being implemented, the working class and the new, free, and unified trade unions which it created and which consider active participation in the revolutionary transformation of society their main task led the way.

The AFGTU welcomes the new peace initiatives and the Soviet Union's unilateral steps and speaks out for uniting all forces in the struggle for peace and security, arms limitation, and disarmament. Along with the fraternal organizations of the European socialist countries, the AFGTU has formulated its position in the Berlin Appeal and the Open Letter to the Working People and Trade Unions of Europe, adopted in Prague. Both documents demonstrate the unity and cohesion of the trade unions of the European socialist countries on the central issues of contemporary life -- the issues of peace and disarmament. This makes it possible to continue the dialogue and meetings of trade unions adhering to different orientations.

P. Amendola, the general secretary of the departmental association of trade unions of Cote d'Azur and member of the Executive Commission of the World Confederation of Labor (WCL) of France, gave a report entitled "The Struggle of the Trade Unions of the Capitalist Countries for Peace, Democracy, and Social Progress." He exposed the unprecedented-in-scope propaganda campaign which influential reactionary forces launched to have contemporary imperialist policy "reinterpret," or rather falsify, the history of World War II and force peoples to forget its tragic consequences. They whitewash the accomplices of Hitlerism and blacken the memory of the heroes of the Resistance to such a degree as to confuse the executioners with the victims. These forces utilize the mass information media extensively, which greatly intensifies anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, and on the trade union front attack the WCL.

Perhaps never before in France's history has such pressure been put on the ideas of social progress, socialism, and peace. This clearly reflects the goals of the class struggle in contemporary France, which continues to be entwined in the crisis of the capitalist system. On the political level this is clearly revealed in the attempt to treat as harmless the fascist and racist

theories of the French follower of Hitler, the sinister Lepen. The revival of the extreme right has already been marked by a whole number of racist crimes.

On the economic level this is the beginning of the denationalization of large enterprises, which deepens the break-up of production and leads to national economic decline. And on the social level it means persistent attempts to narrow the confines of the right to work and nullify 50 years of gains by the trade union movement.

The more favorable the decisions of the present government are for the bosses, P. Amendola said, the easier it is for the government to infringe on social gains and resort to large-scale repressions against WCL trade union organizations.

After a period of expectation and the loss of illusions, dissatisfaction with the larger and more purposeful actions which the WCL decisively heads is beginning to appear. In fulfilling this main mission of the trade union movement, at the same time the WCL is devoting a great deal of attention to the problems of the struggle for peace and disarmament. The WCL leadership is concerned that France's foreign policy more and more clearly exhibits features of Atlanticism as well as the fact that continued maintenance of a high level of military expenditures in conditions of the economic recession will remain a source of inflation, unemployment, and socioeconomic regression.

Taking these factors into account, the WCL defines the two main directions of its activity in the struggle for peace. First, to fight for disarmament and for peace -- above all this is to fight for the primary right of man -- the right to work. Secondly, to stop the escalation of the arms race -- this means improving the socioeconomic position of working people.

That is the reason the WCL resolutely insists on a full reexamination of the very notion of guaranteeing security by accumulating arms. Only negotiations for the purposes of disarmament and peaceful coexistence are today a decisive condition for preserving the life of mankind and the security of every country. In this connection, it is very important that the negotiations begun in Geneva be completed, despite the U.S. position. The speaker emphasized that a careful examination of the proposals of peace-loving forces and governments favoring the principle of disarmament, among them the proposals recently advanced by the Soviet leadership, is essential.

The participants in the plenary meeting also heard a report from P. Rabemananjara, the general secretary of the Federation of Trade Unions of the Revolutionary Workers of Madagascar, on the topic "The Failure of Colonial Empires and the Role of the Trade Unions of the Liberated Countries in the Struggle Against Imperialism and for Peace and Independent Economic and Social Development."

Discussion of the reports was undertaken at the meetings of three problem sections where 104 delegates spoke.

In the work of the first section, "The Victory Over Fascism: The Experience of History and the Antiwar Struggle of Today's Trade Unions" (Doctor of Economic

Sciences O.V. Salkovskiy, the deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences, and P. Amendola, the general secretary of the departmental association of trade unions of Cote d'Azur and member of the WCL executive commission, led the section's meetings), more than 100 delegates representing trade union centers and scientific institutions from 39 countries took part. The 40th anniversary of the Great Victory, the speeches noted, is a prominent date both for all of mankind and for the international workers and trade union movements. The defeat of fascism, in which the Soviet Union made the most sacrifices and played the main role, gave a powerful thrust to the democratic and national-liberation processes and the revolutionary transformations which changed the world's appearance. This was discussed by, among others, Sabri Badra, the deputy general secretary of the ICATU [International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions], Kanjay Ramnat, the chairman of the Federation of Trade Unions of the Workers of Mauritius, and Violetta Stoyanova, member of the Central Committee of Bulgarian Trade Unions and chairman of the Central Committee of the Communications Workers Trade Union.

Turning again and again to the most important lesson of World War II -- we must fight against war before it begins -- and repeating it as a precept, the speakers emphasized that the persistent, everyday struggle to stop the arms race and prevent an all-destroying war is one of the main tasks of the trade union movement. Zeumer Herwig, representative of the FRG metal workers trade union and member of the West German committee of the Workers Conferences of the Countries of the Baltic Sea, Norway, and Iceland; Byeurre Lars, chairman of a department of the unskilled workers trade union of Denmark; Leshek Brojanowski, deputy chairman of the All-Poland Covenant of Trade Unions; and Doctor of Economic Sciences G.Ye. Skorov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada pointed out the need to do everything possible to stop the arms race on earth and not to allow it to move into space.

Muriel Johnson, the general secretary of the university employees and related professions trade union of Jamaica; Vo Viet Dong, member of the executive committee of the Federation of Trade Unions of Vietnam; Hassan al-Grash, secretary of foreign relations of the General Federation of Trade Unions of the Yemen Arab Republic; and many others emphasized that the bearer of the main threat to peace on earth is now U.S. imperialism, which is formulating plans for thermonuclear war, counting on winning it, and forcing the creation of increasingly destructive military potential in order to use this as a means of not only military but also economic blackmail in its strategy which aims at of bleeding the economies of the socialist and unaligned countries white.

A detailed exchange of opinions and the experience of the struggle of trade unions in the interests of working people in the contemporary stage took place during the work of the 2nd section entitled "The Struggle for Working People's Social Rights and Against Monopolies' Attacks on Trade Unions" (Doctor of Economic Sciences A.I. Belchuk, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement, and Lewis Gordon, chief of the legal department of the U.S. Association of Paper Industry Workers Trade Union, supervised the work of this section).

In the years that have passed since the defeat of fascism, the world has changed radically. Imperialism is no longer in a position to dictate its will to peoples. Nonetheless, it is trying to regain its lost positions. Today one of the main goals of state-monopoly capitalism is to take social revenge for the concessions gained by working people in relentless struggle and to shift the serious consequences of the economic, structural, and other crises which capitalism is undergoing to their shoulders. In a number of countries the real incomes of workers and employees have declined. In 1980-1984 the increase in the cost of living exceeded the increase in wages in the United States, Canada, the FRG, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Japan. Appropriations for social needs have been substantially cut; this includes unemployment benefits, and this despite the fact that in the developed capitalist countries the total number of officially registered unemployed reached 30 million people or 9-10 percent of the entire work force in 1983-1984 alone. Aoki Tsunedzi, general secretary of the National Federation of Cement Industry Workers (Churitsu Roren) of Japan; Karlush Karvalyu, member of the National Council of the National Confederation of Portuguese Workers --the National Intersindikal; Peter Harry Hart, assistant secretary of the housepainters and paperhanglers trade union of Australia; as well as A.I. Belchuk and Luis Gordon pointed this out in their speeches.

The participants in the discussion within the framework of the second section noted that bourgeois governments are actively attempting to deprive the working class and trade unions of the most effective means of struggle. Repressive legislation is becoming stricter and is being utilized more and more extensively and frequently and the punitive powers of the police are being increased. Denny Bonvalo, the secretary of the WFTU European Commission; Kemal Daysal, member of the executive committee of the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers of Trade Unions of Turkey (DISK); and Candidate of Juridical Sciences B.N. Zharkov, senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement talked about this. In their speeches representatives of the trade unions of the United States, Japan, the FRG, Honduras, Madagascar, and Sri Lanka cited numerous examples confirming the intensification of the frontal attack of monopolies and the bourgeois state on trade unions.

In recent years the socioeconomic position of the working people of the developing countries has substantially deteriorated, which, as representatives of the trade unions of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America noted in their speeches, is a direct result of the policy of imperialism and neocolonialism, which is steadily advancing through the expansion of transnational corporations. Many of the speakers, among them representatives of the trade unions of Costa Rica, Malta, Trinidad and Tobago, Guinea, and Portugal, sharply criticized the activities of transnational corporations and the credit policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which impose enslaving conditions on developing countries and pressure them to conduct an anti-people and anti-trade union policy as the protracted crisis which has struck many of these countries becomes more acute.

A major obstacle to the development of this group of countries is their increasingly active involvement in the arms race. Therefore, as those participating in an exchange of opinions at the meetings of the second section emphasized, in present conditions the socioeconomic situation in these countries can be improved, hunger and poverty eliminated, equitable mutually advantageous trade-economic relations with developed capitalist countries established, and genuine independence achieved only by activating the struggle against militarism and neocolonialism and capital's attacks on the rights of working people. And the most massive organizations of working people -- trade unions -- are called on to play an important role in doing this.

Those participating in the meetings of the third section entitled "The Defeat of Fascism and Trade Unions' Struggle Against Imperialism and Colonialism and to Solve the Problems of Development in the Interests of Working People" focused their attention on a broad range of issues. Seventy delegates from 41 countries took part in this section's work (Doctor of Juridical Sciences M.V. Baglay, the prorector of the Higher School of the Trade Union Movement of the AUCCTU imeni N.M. Shvernik, and Debkumar Ganguli, WFTU secretary, supervised this work). The defeat of fascism and militarism gave a powerful thrust to the further consolidation of the alliance of world socialism with the national-liberation movement and predetermined the failure of all the colonial empires, on whose ruins about 100 new independent states arose. Hundreds of millions of people who were no more than objects of history in the epoch of the colonial state appeared on the world arena as subjects and creators of social progress. A new detachment of the world trade union movement emerged. Gaston de Jesus Martinez Rivera, the head of the department of scientific research of the Workers University of Mexico, and Hasem Salem Kasem, the chairman of the national committee of workers of Oman, talked of this in their speeches.

During the section's work, the increasing significance of the struggle against militarism and imperialism in our day was noted. The speakers pointed out that U.S. imperialism increases tension, escalates the arms race, and carries out attacks on the rights of working people. All this necessitates the unity and cohesion of working people and their organizations in the struggle for the goals common to all people, said Emil Kedota, member of the bureau of the National Association of Trade Unions of Working People of Benin, Hasan Sepan, deputy chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions of Afghanistan, and many others in their speeches.

On behalf of their organizations, the participants in the discussion declared their solidarity with the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, with the uprising of the people of El Salvador, with the difficult heroic struggle of the Guatemalan patriots, and with the struggle of the working people and trade unions in Chile against the fascist Pinochet regime.

A number of delegates dealt with the questions of the progressive or noncapitalist path of development, which helps solve the main problems of development in the interests of working people. This is clearly apparent, as speakers emphasized using the examples of Tanzania, Afghanistan, Cambodia, and other countries where the conditions are being created to move the means of production into the hands of the working people and progressive socioeconomic

transformations are taking place which not only complete the general democratic, anti-imperialist revolution but also go beyond its bounds, undermine the foundations of capitalist hegemony, and open up a path for socialist transformations.

Those participating in the third section noted the special importance of the cohesion of the working people of all countries and their unity and solidarity. The WFTU secretary D. Ganguli analyzed the position of this largest international association of trade unions, which invariably speaks out for the strengthened ties and unified actions of working people of the entire world. The trade union conference of the countries of Asia and Oceania on the problem of development and the new international economic order, held in Delhi in February 1985, was important in consolidating unity.

According to the conviction of the participants in discussion at all section meetings, one of the most important lessons of World War II and the subsequent development of events is the fact that closer cooperation among all organizations of working people, among them trade unions, who face the need to organize unified trade union actions on the national, regional, and international levels, is necessary in order to protect peace, develop democracy, and insure social progress. Unity is a most important condition for preserving peace and stopping the arms race.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennoy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

MEETING ON INTERNATIONAL WORKERS MOVEMENT HELD

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYY MIR in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 85 pp 159-160

[Article by A.I. Dmitriyev: "A Study of Problems of the Struggle of the Working Class (On the Results of the Expanded Meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD [Institute of the International Workers Movement] Academic Council)"]

[Text] At its expanded meeting the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD Academic Council summarized the preliminary results of the Institute's scientific research activities during the 11th Five-Year Plan period and examined questions which arose in connection with the forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress. Within the complex of work carried out in recent years, the participation of Institute scientists in publishing fundamental research, reflected in the eight-volume "Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii" [The International Workers Movement. Questions of History and Theory], occupies a special place. It will help resolve the tasks of the comprehensive study and generalization of the general experience of the proletarian struggle; it theoretically summarizes the picture of the development of the international working class, which is traced from the time of its conception and the very first steps of the proletariat to our day.

This fundamental scientific work represents a valuable contribution by Soviet social scientists to the recently intensified ideological struggle over problems of the working class and its general-historical mission and a convincing, scientifically substantiated rebuff to the adherents of the ideas of the "transformation" or even "disappearance" of the working class. The international scientific community's substantial interest in it is expressed in particular in the fact that the first volumes of this publication have come out in English, German, Spanish, Czech, Bulgarian, and Japanese. The scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD have given and are giving foreign colleagues assistance in completing the translation.

In the 11th Five-Year Plan period, the Institute's scientists have expanded the sphere and "geography" of research on the problems of the workers movement and the class and anti-imperialist struggle. Above all attention was devoted to the study of new phenomena in the workers movement of the developed capitalist countries in conditions of the exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism and the present phase of the scientific-technical revolution;

urgent problems of the world revolutionary process and the anti-imperialist struggle; questions of the development of the working class and its increased activism in socialist society; and criticism of bourgeois, reformist, and revisionist conceptions.

Research on socioeconomic advances in the zone of developed capitalism and analysis of socioeconomic processes in developing countries, global problems, and the role of liberated countries in world socioeconomic life were deepened within the framework of these directions. At the same time, the formulation of the problems of working people's struggle for unity of actions and their organization in capitalist countries and questions of the antiwar movement and the position of youth and the youth movement in the entire world were intensified.

The participants in the meeting were pleased to establish that certain aspects of scientific research being done which are of great scientific-practical and applied significance have in recent years been singled out as special areas occupying an important place in the current and future plans of the Institute's scientific research work. Named among them above all should be systematic research on the urgent problems of the international trade union movement, which is presently done according to a special plan agreed upon in the AUCCTU. But also included is planned research being done on the processes in contemporary social democracy, analysis of its socioeconomic doctrines and political principles, and study of the potential and prospects of cooperation between communists and social democrats. In particular, the results of the scientific symposium of scientists of the socialist countries on the problem "The Economic Strategy and Economic Policy of Contemporary Social Democracy," held in early 1985 in Budapest, were discussed.

The council also examined the tasks of the Institute's collective in 1985 to prepare for the 27th CPSU Congress, the 40th anniversary of the defeat of fascism, and the conduct of the International Researchers' Forum on the Working Class and the Workers Movement. It was noted that these tasks and particular ways to fulfill them have already been reflected in the plan for the Institute's scientific research work for 1985. The following topics are being elaborated in order to insure a deep analysis of new phenomena in the international workers movement and trends in the development of the working class and the world revolutionary process in the 1980's: urgent problems of the communist and workers movement in industrially developed capitalist countries; 1980's capitalism and the position of working people; new phenomena in the anti-imperialist struggle and the working masses; transnational corporations and the working class; trends of development of the working class of the USSR and the socialist community in the present phase of the scientific-technical revolution; the antiwar movement and working people; and trends in the strike struggle of working people in the capitalist world.

The topic "the class struggle and the national question" occupies an important place in research; leaders of the Communist Party of Ireland -- J. Stewart, the general secretary of the party and M. O'Riordan, its national chairman -- took part in the discussion of the topic at the Academic Council meeting. At the council it was noted that study of the experience of the struggle of the Irish working class and the problems of the workers and national-liberation

movements in Ireland is of great significance to the elaboration of this topic, since it is precisely here that the hopelessness of the imperialist solution to the national question has been revealed most fully and sharply, and the path of consistent democratism has been identified as the only possible prospect for its solution. The Irish visitors were acquainted with research on the Irish problem being done at the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD; for their part they discussed certain most important aspects of the present situation in the country and disclosed the position of the Communist Party of Ireland on solving the Irish problem.

Long-standing, fruitful ties maintained by IMRD scientists with a number of fraternal communist and workers parties of capitalist countries and prominent figures of the international communist and workers movements have become one of the traditional forms of international cooperation of the Institute. The participation of the leaders of the Communist Party of Ireland in the meeting of the Academic Council and the discussion which took place attest to the further deepening and expansion of this cooperation being carried out in the spirit of genuine internationalism.

In their speeches, the IMRD director T.T. Timofeyev and other participants in the meeting noted the great significance of international and applied research problems. The Problem Commission of Multilateral Cooperation of the academies of science of socialist countries, "The Working Class and the World Revolutionary Process," created in 1972, plays a special role in implementing this type of ties. Scientists from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia are taking part in its work; the coordinator is the USSR Academy of Sciences. The Problem Commission has now become a major center for coordinating and organizing scientific research on the problems of the world revolutionary process and the international workers and communist movements being conducted in the countries of the socialist community.

In its work the Problem Commission proceeds from the decisions of the party congresses of fraternal countries on further deepening of the interaction of communist and workers parties and the states of the socialist community on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletariat and socialist internationalism. The results of joint scientific research convincingly confirm the conclusions of the CPSU and the fraternal parties that the formulation of the most important problems of Marxist social science is only possible in contemporary conditions on the basis of the international efforts of the scientists of the fraternal countries. This concerns comparative research on the processes of socialist transformations in the fraternal countries, developed in recent years within the framework of the Problem Commission, and, in particular, the study of trends in the development of the working class in the countries of the socialist community, the conditions and forms of its constructive activities, and questions of the entry of the young generation in socialist countries into work life.

The joint summary works of the scientists of the socialist countries published since the early 1980's on the results of the above-mentioned research were awarded International Prizes for Outstanding Research in the Social Sciences Field by decisions of the 5th (1982) and 6th (1984) conferences of the academies of sciences of the socialist countries.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

12424

CSO: 1807/057

END